AN ANALYSIS BETWEEN TEACHER TRUST IN THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER BURNOUT AS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS IN SELECTED TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Dissertation

by

JASON W. CEYANES, SR.

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2004

Major Subject: Educational Administration

AN ANALYSIS BETWEEN TEACHER TRUST IN THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER BURNOUT AS IDENTIFIED BY TEACHERS IN SELECTED TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Dissertation

by

JASON W. CEYANES, SR.

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

Robert O. Slater (Chair of Committee)	John R. Hoyle (Member)
Linda Skrla (Member)	Lloyd Korhonen (Member)
James Scheurich (Head of Department)	

December 2004

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

An Analysis Between Teacher Trust in the Principal and Teacher Burnout as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools. (December 2004)

Jason W. Ceyanes, Sr., B.A., University of Houston – Clear Lake; M.S., University of Houston – Clear Lake

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Robert O. Slater

Developing trusting relationships and reducing teacher burnout are two pressing issues that principals and superintendents confront on a daily basis in public schools. With the increasing demands of state mandated testing, No Child Left Behind, and improving standards for all students, principals and superintendents need to understand the relationship between the factors that influence student performance and a positive learning environment.

The purpose of this study was to analyze teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools. In this study, a cross-tabulation of teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal indicated a moderate to strong association between the two variables. The Pearson product-moment

correlation produced a strong, positive correlation of 0.61 ($p<0.01$) between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout. In addition, teachers who indicated low trust in the principal are about 28 percent more likely to experience high teacher burnout. In fact, out of the 315 teachers who completed this survey, not one teacher who reported high teacher trust in the principal scored high on teacher burnout.

Next, the researcher explored how selected demographic variables influenced the teacher trust-burnout relationship. According to this study, the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal has a strong influence on the teacher trust-burnout relationship, and the teacher's age and the teacher's experience have a moderate effect. In addition, teacher gender appears to have a slight effect on the teacher trust-burnout relationship, and principal gender, principal age, and principal race appear to not affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship at all. The researcher was unable to draw any conclusions on the influence of teacher race on the teacher trust-burnout relationship due to the small number of African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race teacher respondents.

Finally, the multivariate regression analysis suggested that teacher trust in the principal and the demographic variables in this study account for nearly 40 percent of the variance for teacher burnout. The results of this study suggest that principals must focus on developing trusting relationships with their teachers to reduce teacher burnout.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated first and foremost to God the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, my personal Lord and Savior. Without His wisdom, knowledge, and guidance, I would not have accomplished anything in my life.

To my wife and children, who sacrificed many hours of time away from their husband and father so that I could complete this work. You are my inspiration and passion.

To my father, who taught me more than anything that an education can overcome many of life’s obstacles and instilled in me the importance of being a lifelong learner.

To my mother, who has always been there for me in my times of need. You have been a support and encouragement.

To my grandmother, Helen Ceyanes, who taught first grade in Brownsville, Texas, for thirty-five years. You began a legacy of educators who will change the world one child at a time.

And finally, to my grandmother, Margaret Jones, who has encouraged me to become a professor at a distinguished university. I hope that I will have the opportunity to accomplish this goal at Texas A&M University.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I appreciate the feedback, encouragement, and patience from the members of my committee. I thank Dr. Slater for his assistance and for keeping me focused on completing this work. I express gratitude to Dr. John Hoyle for his positive guidance, constant encouragement, and the many stories that provided instruction and entertainment. Although I have never physically been to Abilene, I have many times professionally and mentally traveled there. I will always have Dr. Hoyle's story to remind me to turn around before traveling too far. I express thanks to Dr. Linda Skrla for keeping me focused on completing research that is meaningful and statistically significant. I am grateful to Dr. Lloyd Korhonen for his feedback and comments during the development of this study, the preliminary examination, and the proposal hearing.

I am forever indebted to Dr. Bob Hall, who even though he did not officially serve on my dissertation committee, his statistical expertise, time, and effort in the development of the on-line survey, data collection, and data analysis was invaluable. Without the assistance of Dr. Hall, I would not have completed this work for at least an additional two years.

I further thank Bill Ashworth, my Christian brother and friend, for his dedication to all of us and his assistance with the proposal, survey, IRB approval, and all of the technical requirements for this study and my doctoral work. He is a true blessing, and I will always remember his servanthood. He is a hero, and I hope that one day I will have the servant’s heart that he so diligently displays.

I appreciate Mike Holland, Superintendent at Magnolia ISD, Raymond Morris, Superintendent at Burton ISD, Dr. Guy Sconzo, Superintendent at Humble ISD, and Dr. Bob Smith, Superintendent at Montgomery ISD, for allowing me to complete the coursework and requirements for this dissertation while being employed in their school districts. Without their cooperation, understanding, and commitment to my professional development, I would not have been able to complete this work.

Finally, to the principals and superintendents who allowed me to survey their teachers, I am grateful for their willingness to assist with this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of Developing Trusting Relationships

Deming (1993) wrote in the foreword to John Whitney's book, The Trust Factor, "Trust is mandatory for optimization of a system. Without trust, there cannot be cooperation between people, teams, departments, or divisions.... The job of a leader is to create an environment of trust so that everyone may confidently examine himself" (p. viii). A review of the literature suggests that leaders must recognize the factors that build trustful relationships within their organizations. Knowing that we can have more functional schools by developing trust among those in schools leads to the question as to why so many of our organizations and institutions have such mistrusting cultures.

Covey (1992) believes that if there is little or no trust, there is no opportunity to build permanent success. Covey (1989) also argues that "trust is the highest form of human motivation. It brings out the best in people. But it takes time and patience..." (p. 178).

The style and format of this dissertation follow that of *The Journal of Educational Research.*

Ross Perot, in an interview about 21st century leadership, stated that

> There's nothing more fragile than another person's trust. There is no short cut. You have to earn it. You have to deserve it, day after day, for years. You can lose it in an instant. If you lose it, you'll probably never get it back. How do you get and keep people's trust and respect? Simply by doing what you say you will do. By not playing games with them. By not using them for your benefit. (McFarland, Senn, and Childress, 1994, p. 73)

Maxwell (1993) focuses primarily on the issue of integrity as the key to being a successful leader. Maxwell (1993) defines integrity as "not what we do as much as who we are" (p. 33). In this discussion, Maxwell (1993) establishes trust as being essential to the definition of integrity. Maxwell (1993) quotes a study in which "only forty-five percent of four hundred managers in a Carnegie-Mellon survey believed their top management; a third distrusted their immediate bosses" (p. 35). Maxwell (1993) continues to state that "with so much depending on credibility and trust, someone in every organization must provide the leadership to improve these numbers" (p. 35).

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) believe that “trust is central to relationships. It is the glue that holds most cooperative relationships” (p. 129). Furthermore, Lewicki and Bunker (1996) argue that

> Trust is so intimately connected to the fundamental nature of a relationship that trust-shattering events that cannot be repaired will probably be coincident with destroying the essence of the relationship itself. If the relationship does sustain, it is likely to be a “shell” in which only the most formal, emotionally distant, and calculative exchanges can continue to occur. (p. 129)

Schmuck and Schmuck (1997) believe that “groups, like individuals begin relationships by first building a sense of trust in others. A since of trust, at whatever level, affects future relationships” (p. 259). According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000),

> Trust is fundamental to functioning in our complex and interdependent society. We count on the people who grow and process our food and medicines to do so properly; we depend on those who build our houses to do so sensibly; we rely on other people with whom we share the roadways to obey traffic laws; we trust

> those who hold and invest our money to deal with us honestly; we depend on our government to maintain the safety of our infrastructure and to protect us from aggressors. In short, in every facet of our lives, we are dependent on other people to behave in accordance with our expectations. It is imperative that we have confidence that our expectations of other people are met. (p. 549)

Fukuyama (1995) believes that a high trust society can organize its workplace on a more flexible and group oriented basis, with more responsibility delegated to lower levels of the organization. “Low trust societies, by contrast, must fence in and isolate their workers with a series of bureaucratic rules” (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 31). Fukuyama (1995) further states that professionals tend to be trusted to a higher degree than nonprofessionals and therefore, operate in a less rule-bound environment. “There is usually an inverse relationship between rules and trust: the more people depend on rules to regulate their interactions, the less they trust others, and vice versa” (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 224).

In a ten year study of more than 400 Chicago elementary schools, Bryk and Schneider (2003) found that a school with a low score on relational trust

> had only a one-in-seven chance of demonstrating improved academic productivity. In contrast, half of the schools that scored high on relational trust were in the improved group. On average, these improving schools recorded increases in student learning of 8 percent in reading and 20 percent in mathematics in a five year period. The schools in the nonimproving group lost ground in reading and stayed about the same in mathematics. Most significant was the finding that schools with chronically weak trust reports throughout the period of the study had virtually no chance of improving in either reading or mathematics. (p. 43)

The Importance of Reducing Teacher Burnout

Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) state that “many organizations have launched programs to combat burnout without understanding what it is, why it exists, or even whom it is effecting. Though the term burnout has a ‘trendy’ connotation, the feelings that teachers are expressing do not” (p. 72). In a National Education Association (NEA) poll taken in 1979, the NEA “found that

fewer than 40 percent of the teachers polled would choose a teaching career if they had it to do over again. Four out of 10 teachers surveyed claimed they planned to quit teaching before retirement age" (p. 39).

When asking 398 teachers in a sample from New York if they would chose to become a teacher if they had to do it again, Farber (1984a) found that a total of 21% "never felt this way, and 47.6% said they have felt this way either never or rarely; only 32.5% of teachers reported that they frequently felt this way" (p. 327). Furthermore, Farber (1984a), reported that

> Comments that some teachers included on their returned survey forms suggest that administrators, including principals, are not perceived as being on the "same side" as teachers, and that they (the administrators) are more interested in protecting their own images and positions than they are in improving school conditions for either teachers or students. (p. 329)

In another study, Farber (1984b) discussed the importance of reducing burnout by stating that "teacher burnout will not 'go away,' at least in the near future. Despite criticism of the concept, teacher burnout has become an

issue of increasingly greater public and professional concern" (p. 333). In addition, Farber (1984b) stated that

> When enough teachers in a school spend their lunch hours denigrating students, complaining about administrators, regretting their choice of careers and planning for new ones, then burnout begins to feel less like a shameful emotion and more like a battle wound worth showing off. (p. 325)

In a paper discussing the international implications of burnout, Kyriacou (1987) stated that the

> concern with teacher stress and burnout stems from (1) the mounting evidence that prolonged occupational stress can lead to both mental and physical ill-health, (2) a general concern to improve the quality of teacher's working lives and (3) a concern that stress and burnout may significantly impair the working relationship a teacher has with his pupils and the quality of teaching and commitment he is able to display. There has also been a recent increase in the number of teachers claiming early retirement pensions on grounds of ill-health precipitated by stress and attempts by teacher unions to include an element in their salary claims to cover stress. (p. 147)

Statement of the Problem

Barth (1990) clearly outlines the critical role of the principal in leading the school. Barth (1990) claims that although much has been written about school reform in the past decade, insufficient attention has been given to the important relationships among the adults within the school. Barth (1990) further asserts that adversarial relationships exist among adults and attacks on the ideas of others are common. Many schools have a climate of competition that creates an environment that interferes with a desire for all within the school to succeed. Barth (1990) demonstrates how this adversarial position exists by using lists of "mind boggling" rules and regulations that schools produce.

Seyfarth (1999) states that principal's leadership involves creating and sustaining trust. According to MacNeil, Spuck and Ceyanes (1998), the concept of trust building is equally if not greater than the importance of principal leadership. MacNeil, Spuck and Ceyanes (1998) state that "in the absence of trust, it does not matter what the principal's leadership skills or professional competence may be, trust must be established first" (p. 4). Dworkin, Saha, and Hill (2003) found that principals played a significant role in teacher burnout. If a relationship

exists between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout, then principals should consider focusing on developing trusting relationships with teachers and therefore, possibly reduce teacher burnout.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools, and if there is a relationship, to further investigate other variables that may have an impact on it.

Research Questions

This study will address the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools?
2. Do other variables, such as demographic factors, mediate the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools?

Operational Definitions

Trust: “One party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open” (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2000, p. 556).

Teacher Burnout: “Burnout is conceptualized as a form of alienation involving the dimensions described by Seeman (1959, 1975), including powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and estrangement” (Dworkin, 2001, p. 70).

Principal: The instructional leader of a public school established by a superintendent and a local school board.

Teacher: An individual who is certified by the Texas State Board of Educator Certification and currently employed by a school district to provide instruction to students in a Texas public school.

Public School: An educational institute funded through the State of Texas containing any combination of grades PK - 12.

Selected Demographic Variables: Demographics of the teachers completing the survey include gender, age, race, teacher's years experience, and the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal. Demographics of

the principals identified by the teachers in the study include the principal's gender, age, and race.

Assumptions

1. The researcher used an instrument that provided data that was reliable and valid for the purpose of the study.
2. The respondents understood the instrument and responded objectively and honestly.
3. The researcher was impartial in collecting and analyzing the data.
4. Teachers in the sample were able to click on the website link contained in the e-mail and complete the on-line survey.

Limitations

1. The study was limited to data collected from teachers who teach in selected Texas public schools.
2. The findings of the study may only be applicable to teachers in Texas.
3. The technological requirements of the survey may have limited the ability of the identified schools and teachers to answer the survey.

Significance Statement

Sergiovanni (1994) believes that “community” rather than “organization” is the better metaphor for schools. Beck (1994) suggests that leaders should think of a model of governance as a circle instead of as a pyramid, implying a completely new set of relationships. Lambert, et al. (1995) claim that building trusting relationships is the backbone of community building in schools. As Speck (1999) points out, trust is the “. . . ingredient to developing a learning community . . . without trust, the learning community cannot function” (p. 59).

If a relationship exists between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout, then principals should focus time and energy on developing trusting relationships with their teachers, thus potentially reducing teacher burnout.

Hypothesis

The main hypothesis in this study is that as trust increases, burnout decreases. In a more technical explanation, teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout should be inversely correlated.

Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation contains five major chapters. Chapter I includes an introduction, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the operational definitions, and a significance statement. Chapter II includes a review of the literature. Chapter III explains the methodology for the research, and Chapter IV contains the results of the data analysis. Finally, Chapter V includes the summary, conclusions, discussions, recommendations, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Trust Defined

Hosmer (1995) recognizes the difficulty in defining trust when he states that, “there appears to be wide-spread agreement on the importance of trust in human conduct, but unfortunately there also appears to be an equally widespread lack of agreement on a suitable definition of the construct” (p. 380).

Golembiewski and McConkie (1975) capture the essence of the commonly accepted definition of trust when they define trust as “...reliance on, or confidence in, some event, process, or person” (p. 133). Most definitions of trust accompanying empirical studies center around three major foci: (1) the trusting relationship between two individuals (Frost and Moussavi, 1992; Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994; Rempel and Holmes, 1986; and Zand 1972), (2) the trust between the individual and the organization (Driscoll, 1973; Hoy and Kupersmith, 1985; and Zand, 1972) and (3) trust in events or processes (Golembiewski and McConkie, 1975; Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, and Hoy, 1994).

Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, and Hoy (1994) define trust as a "general confidence and overall optimism in occurring events; it is believing in others in the absence of compelling reasons to disbelieve" (p. 486). Specifically, Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, and Hoy (1994) define trust in the principal as, "the faculty (having) confidence that the principal will keep his or her word and act in the best interest of the teachers" (p. 486). Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy (1995) further define trust as the "generalized expectancy held by teachers that the word, action, and written or oral statement of others can be relied upon" (p. 42).

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) identify three types of trust. First, Lewicki and Bunker (1996) define calculus-based trust in which

> Individuals will do what they say because they fear the consequences of not doing what they say. Like any behavior based on a theory of deterrence, trust is sustained to the degree that the deterrent (punishment) is clear, possible, and likely to occur if the trust is violated. (p. 119)

Second, Lewicki and Bunker (1996) describe knowledge-based trust as being

> grounded in the other's predictability – knowing the other sufficiently well so that the other's behavior is anticipatable... It develops over time, largely as a function of the parties having a history of interaction that allows them to develop a generalized expectancy that the other's behavior is predictable and that he or she will act trustworthy. (p. 121)

Finally, Lewicki and Bunker (1996) describe identification-based trust as being

> based on identification with the other's desires and intentions. At this third level, trust exists because the parties effectively understand and appreciate the other's wants; this mutual understanding is developed to the point that each can effectively act for the other. (p. 122)

In a study of 33 managers from more than a dozen firms, the managers described trust by identifying characteristics such as competence, openness, concern for another party's welfare or interests, and reliability, dependability, or consistency between words and action (Mishra, 1996). In this study, Mishra (1996) defines trust as "one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is

(a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable" (p. 265).

Cummings and Bromiley (1996) contribute to the understanding of trust by defining the construct as

> an individual's belief or a common belief among a group of individuals that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available. (p. 303)

In addition, Cummings and Bromiley (1996) argue that the "rationale for this definition of trust rests on the socially embedded, subjective, and optimistic nature of most interactions within and between organizations that involve trust" (p. 303).

Rousseau, et al. (1998) acknowledge the difficulty in defining trust when they state that "to date, we have had no universally accepted scholarly definition of trust" (p. 394). Although Rousseau, et al. (1998) recognize the challenge in defining trust, they describe trust as a "psychological state comprising the intention to accept

vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (p. 395).

MacNeil and Ceyanes (1998) define trust as the reliability of the relationship that exists between people, developed over time caused by the behaviors that are formed by the principles and competencies of a person.

Whitener, et al. (1998) use a three-facet description to define trust. Whitener, et al. (1998) argue that

> Trust in another party reflects an expectation or belief that the other party will act benevolently. Second, one cannot control or force the other party to fulfill this expectation – that is, trust involves a willingness to be vulnerable and risk that the other party may not fulfill that expectation. Third, trust involves some level of dependency on the other party so that the outcomes of one individual are influenced by the actions of another. (p. 513)

McKnight, Cummings, and Chervany (1998) define trust “to mean that one believes in, and is willing to depend on, another party” (p. 474). They continue their definition of trust by stating that “this high-level trust concept can be broken into two constructs: (1) trusting intention, meaning that one is willing to depend on the other person in a

given situation” and “(2) trusting beliefs, meaning that one believes the other person is benevolent, competent, honest, or predictable in a situation” (McKnight, Cummings, and Chervany, 1998, p. 474).

Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) define “trust in terms of confident positive expectations regarding another’s conduct, and distrust in terms of confident negative expectations regarding another’s conduct” (p. 439). Furthermore, they “assert that both trust and distrust involve movements toward certainty: trust concerning expectations of things hoped for and distrust concerning expectations of things feared” (Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies, 1998, p. 439).

Jones and George (1998) propose that “trust is a psychological construct, the experience of which is the outcome of the interaction of people’s values, attitudes, and moods and emotions” (p. 532). Jones and George (1998) further divide the construct of trust into conditional and unconditional trust. According to Jones and George (1998),

> Conditional trust is a state of trust in which both parties are willing to transact with each other, as long as each behaves appropriately, uses a similar

> interpretative scheme to define the situation, and can take the role of the other. (p. 536)

Jones and George (1998) continue to state that

> Unconditional trust, however, characterizes an experience of trust that starts when individuals abandon the “pretense” of suspending belief, because shared values now structure the social situation and become the primary vehicle through which those individuals experience trust. With unconditional trust each party’s trustworthiness is now assured, based on confidence in the other’s values that is backed up by empirical evidence derived from repeated behavioral interactions – knowledge of which is contained in each individual’s attitude toward the other. (pp. 536 – 537)

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) define trust as “one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open” (p. 556). For purposes of this study, the researcher will use this definition of trust because Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) used this definition when developing the Omnibus T-scale, which is the instrument that the researcher used to

measure teacher trust in the principal during this research.

Teacher Burnout Defined

Maslach and Jackson (1984) state that “because it has a catchy ring to it, burnout is sometimes immediately dismissed as a fad or as pseudoscientific jargon that is all surface flash and no substance” (p. 139). Farber (1984b) argues that “teacher burnout has always been around, masquerading in the past under names such as job dissatisfaction and worker alienation” (p. 324).

Researchers appear to agree on one issue relating to burnout, that burnout is not easily defined. Byrne (1994) recognizes the difficulty in defining burnout by stating that “to date there is still no universally accepted definition of burnout” (p. 646), and Farber (1984b) agrees by noting that “there is no agreed-upon definition of what constitutes teacher burnout” (p. 325). Even though many researchers have disagreed on one universal definition of burnout, exploring the different definitions assists a person in understanding the components of the phenomenon.

Freudenberger (1974) first used the term “burnout” in the literature to describe a condition where individuals work so hard that they become physically exhausted. In

1980, Freudenberger and Richelson describe the burnout process as follows: “to deplete oneself; to exhaust one’s physical and mental resources; to wear oneself out by excessively striving to reach some unrealistic expectation imposed by oneself or by the values of society” (p. 16). Maslach and Jackson (1981), two of the pioneers for burnout research, define burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind” (p. 1). Later, Maslach and Jackson (1986) expand their definition of burnout to include “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind” (p. 1).

Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) contribute to the understanding of teacher burnout by explaining that

> Public school teachers are subject to stressful situations as a result of many problems confronting them today. Among the more pressing problems are declining enrollments, staff reduction, poor public opinions regarding education, a rise in violence and vandalism, and tight budget constraints. Currently, teachers unable to cope with their stress resulting

> from the impact of such problems on their performance have been labeled as “burned out.” (p. 60)

In 1983, Cunningham defines burnout “as the inability to cope adequately with the stresses of one’s work or personal life” (p. 37). Cunningham (1983) argues that “teacher stress and burnout is not a stylish fad which will just fade away or evaporate, but a profound problem which must be addressed if the quality and productivity of American education is not to slip considerably” (p. 48).

Farber (1984b) builds on the construct of teacher burnout by describing burnout as the

> final step in a progression of unsuccessful attempts to cope with negative stress conditions. Burnout then “is the result not of stress per se (which may be inevitable in the helping professions) but of unmediated stress – of being stressed and having no “out,” no buffers, no support system.” (p. 324)

In addition, Pines (1993) states that

> Burnout is a negative state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that is the end result of a gradual process of disillusionment. It is typically found among highly motivated individuals who work over

> long periods of time in situations that are emotionally demanding. (p. 51)

Burisch (1993) believes that “burnout is used as a generic name for certain ill-defined types of crises. It is a fuzzy set of symptoms or a fuzzy set of people with symptoms. Both sets overlap considerably with neighboring sets” (p. 76). Furthermore, Burisch (1993) agrees with other scholars that “there seems as yet to be no satisfactory way of defining burnout, and progress toward understanding it is hampered by the fact that it is an undefined entity that is being discussed” (p. 77).

Hallsten (1993) argues that the basic problem with burnout is that it “does not have a sufficiently distinctive character in comparison with such related concepts as depression, stress, and alienation. Its etiology and its distinguishing aspects in relation to these phenomena are not specified” (p. 96). Hallsten (1993) continues by defining burnout as

> a form of depression that results from the process of burning out, which is a necessary cause of burnout. Hence, burning out is one route to depression. Burning out is assumed to appear when the enactment of an

> active, self-definitional role is threatened or disrupted with no alternative role at hand. (p. 99)

Friedman (1995) defines burnout as “a work related syndrome that stems from an individual’s perception of a significant discrepancy between effort (input) and reward (output)” (p. 281). In addition, Friedman (1991) recognizes the two central aspects of burnout. First is the “personality perspective, which relates to the issue of the profile of the worker with a higher propensity to burn out, and to those personality factors and background variables of the worker that may explain a proclivity toward burnout” (Friedman, 1991, p. 325). The second aspect that Friedman (1991) acknowledges “is the organizational perspective, which relates to the issue of what organizational variables (the organization’s climate and culture, social, and professional support in the workplace, etc.) explain the process of burnout” (p. 325).

Dworkin (2001) believes that teacher burnout is defined as both a “psychological and sociological construct” (p.69). According to Dworkin, Saha and Hill (2003), “research on burnout has generally come from a psychological orientation, which views burnout as a failure to cope with job stress” (p. 108). For purposes of this

study, the researcher will utilize the sociological definition, which views burnout as “the result of the conjoined effects of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and estrangement (Dworkin et al., 2003, p. 109). The researcher will utilize the later definition because in the sociological definition, “burnout is seen as organizationally induced and should thus be redressed through organizational change not personal coping” (Dworkin, Saha and Hill, 2003, p. 109).

To better understand the meaning of the Dworkin definition of teacher burnout, the researcher utilized the alienation work of Seeman (1975). Seeman (1975) explains the six components of alienation as following:

> (a) powerlessness – the sense of low control vs. mastery over events; (b) meaninglessness – the sense of incomprehensibility vs. understanding of personal and social affairs; (c) normlessness – high expectancies for (or commitment to) socially unapproved means vs. conventional means for the achievement of given goals; (d) cultural estrangement (called “value isolation” in an earlier version, Seeman 1959) – the individual’s rejection of commonly held values in the society (or subsector) vs.

> commitment to the going group standards; (e) self-estrangement – the individuals' engagement in activities that are not intrinsically rewarding vs. involvement in a task or activity for its own sake; and (f) social isolation – the sense of exclusion or rejection vs. social acceptance. (pp. 93 – 4)

Effects of Trust and Distrust

Kanter (1997) states that mistrust in an organization sets off a vicious cycle and that without trust, "it makes success harder to attain, which means someone has to be blamed for the lack of success" (p. 238). This blaming causes more mistrust. Tyler and Kramer (1996) argue that "as trust declines, people are increasingly unwilling to take risks, demand greater protections against the possibility of betrayal, and increasingly insist on costly sanctioning mechanisms to defend their interests" (p. 4). Mishra (1996) interviewed 33 managers from eleven firms and found that trust leads to decentralized decision-making, undistorted communication, collaboration, and crisis resolution.

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) note that the decline in trust sometimes "occurs in a single violation that is so severe that it effectively eliminates all trust; other

times the decline is a more gradual erosion of trust" (p. 125). According to Lewicki and Bunker (1996), "emotionally, individuals often experience strong feelings of anger, hurt, fear, and frustration; these reactions lead them to reassess how they feel about the other" (p. 125).

Fukuyama (1995) states that communities depend on mutual trust to be successful. Fukuyama (1995) describes trust as the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviors, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community. "By contrast, people who do not trust one another will end up cooperating only under a system of formal rules and regulations, which have to be negotiated, agreed to, litigated, and enforced, sometimes by coercive means" (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 27).

Jones and George (1998) discuss the effects of conditional and unconditional trust by stating that

> Conditional trust – in which developing attitudes are favorable enough to support interactions – is sufficient to facilitate many kinds of exchanges between coworkers in organizational settings or business acquaintances. When unconditional trust exists – in which shared values create a common bond –

> a different scenario occurs; people begin to feel that they are not mere coworkers or business acquaintances but colleagues, friends, or team members. In other words, although the presence of conditional trust allows a group to work toward a common goal, the existence of unconditional trust can fundamentally change the quality of exchange relationship and convert a group into a team. (p. 539)

In addition, unconditional trust has positive effects on broad role definitions, communal relationships, high confidence in others, help-seeking behavior, free exchange of knowledge and information, subjugation of personal needs and ego for the greater common good, and high involvement in the activity of others (Jones and George, 1998). Jones and George (1998) further argue that “at the organizational level the performance benefits deriving from unconditional trust include the competitive advantage that accrues from an organization’s ability to reap the value added produced by teamwork, synergy, and the development of valuable organizational capabilities” (p. 542).

Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) “propose that trust and distrust are not opposite ends of a single continuum. There are elements that contribute to the growth

and decline of trust, and there are elements that contribute to the growth and decline of distrust" (p. 440). They argue that a person can experience both trust and distrust simultaneously within a relationship. Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) contend that high trust is characterized by hope, faith, confidence, assurance, and initiative while low trust is characterized by no hope, no faith, no confidence, passivity, and hesitance. In contrast, high distrust is characterized by fear, skepticism, cynicism, wariness and watchfulness, and vigilance, while low distrust is characterized by no fear, absence of skepticism, absence of cynicism, low monitoring, and no vigilance (Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies, 1998). A person may exhibit high trust and low distrust with a person simultaneously depending on the situation. For example, a person may have high trust that a person will complete a task effectively, but high distrust that the same person can keep a very personal and sensitive secret. Although many scholars and researchers view trust and distrust as opposite ends of a spectrum, Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) view trust and distrust as separate constructs each having its own positive and negative effects.

Ouchi (1981) perceived trust to be the fundamental feature of superior subordinate relationship in successful organizations. The implications for schools and for the leadership of those schools are important. Without trust, site-based decision-making, teaming, and collaboration cannot occur. Knowledge of trust--what it is, how it is created, and how it is destroyed is critical to creating a positive learning community.

Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy (1995) contend that “effective school principals are actively engaged in the organizational life of the school and support the faculty. Such principals are strong, energetic leaders who apparently affect the outcomes of schooling” (p. 46). In a study of 2777 middle school teachers from New Jersey, Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy (1995) found that “what is important to effectiveness in middle schools appears to be a culture of trust, a pervasive atmosphere of trust where teachers not only have confidence in the principal but also rely on each other as well” (p. 46). In addition, Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy (1995) argue that in schools with a supportive environment,

> teachers develop harmonious, open professional relations with their colleagues, come to trust the

> principal, and finally, each other. It is an atmosphere of openness and professionalism that leads to a trust and cooperation among colleagues and the principal, which ultimately promotes effective schools. (pp. 47 – 48)

Norton, et al. (1996) write that “trust is the key to maintenance of a strong professional and personal identity. People who are trusted are reliable and constant. On important issues they do not waffle or shy away from the set of principles that guide them” (p. 54). Norton, et al. (1996) further believe that

> A key to managing trust is to be focused on the set of intentions that have been shared with constituencies. It means that leaders must live up to the expectations, that they are predictable in matters that involve the vision of the school district. (p. 54)

Baloche (1998) states that “in the early stages of group life, individuals tend to be mistrustful, uncertain, cautious and fearful” (p. 25). “When groups are able to build trust, fear diminishes and groups have the opportunity to build communication and decision-making

systems that are honest and responsive to group problems and tasks" (Baloche, 1998, p. 25). Studies suggest that

> In classrooms with high levels of trust, students believe that others are working towards learning and towards the best interests of the group. In classrooms with high levels of trust, proportionately more student and teacher time is spent on learning than in classrooms with low levels of trust; in low-trust classrooms, organizational and relationship issues consume more time. (Baloche, 1998, p. 46)

Bryk and Schneider (2003) argue that "collective decision making with broad teacher buy-in, a crucial ingredient for reform, occurs more readily in schools with strong relational trust" (pp. 42 – 3). Bryk and Schneider (2003) also contend that strong relational trust "makes it more likely that reform initiatives will diffuse broadly across the school because trust reduces the sense of risk associated with change" (p. 43). Finally, Bryk and Schneider (2003) claim that "relational trust supports a moral imperative to take on the difficult work of school improvement" (p. 43).

Effects of Teacher Burnout

Jackson and Maslach (1982) surveyed 142 police couples whose wives attended the annual meeting of the California Police Officers' Wife Club. In the study, Jackson and Maslach (1982) found "a strong relationship between burnout and a desire to quit one's job/occupation. This effect was due mostly to the correlation between intensity of emotional exhaustion and a desire to quit" (p. 70).

Burisch (1993) suggests the following core symptoms of burnout, "while admitting that the terms lack precision" (p. 78):

- Hyper- or hypoactivity
- Feelings of helplessness, depression, and exhaustion.
- Inner unrest
- Reduced self-esteem and demoralization
- Deteriorating or deteriorated social relationships
- Some active striving to bring about a change (a characteristic that distinguishes burned-out individuals from people mourning some loss) (Burish, 1993, p. 78).

Winnubst (1993) believes that social support relates to stress and burnout. According to Winnubst (1993),

> As a result of the work climate, people can find themselves in a downward spiral; they feel lonelier and lonelier, and more and more isolated from colleagues and the outer world. Their social relations become fewer, and depression, burnout, and disease loom on the horizon. (p. 155)

In a study of 80 male mangers from chemical, electronic, steel and construction companies, Noworol, et al., (1993) found that

> People who are experiencing burnout are characterized by less creativity, on several dimensions, and by an adaptive style of problem solving. In contrast, people who are not experiencing burnout are more creative, on various dimensions, and display an innovative style of problem solving. (p. 173)

In the educational environment, Cunningham (1983) claims that “burnout results in reduced pupil-teacher rapport, teacher warmth, teacher satisfaction, pupil motivation, and ultimately teaching effectiveness. With burnout comes increases in absenteeism, truancy, career

changes, and early retirement” (p. 38). Cunningham (1983) continues to explain that

> Symptoms of burnout often begin with a feeling of uneasiness. Symptoms include being tired all the time, dissatisfied, depressed, and physically run down. Teachers experiencing burnout often have minor physical maladies such as insomnia, frequent colds, headaches, and dizziness, loss of appetite or sexual interest, and diarrhea. Such teachers report somatic illness such as fatigue and weakness, blurred vision, irritability, sensitivity to weather, difficulty in coping, dizziness, malaise, and depression. (p. 40)

Farber (1984b) adds to the effects of teacher burnout by claiming that

> Teachers who become burned out may be less sympathetic toward students, may have lower tolerance for frustration in the classroom, may plan for their classes less often or less carefully, may fantasize about or actually plan on leaving the profession, may feel frequently emotionally or physically exhausted, may feel anxious, irritable, depressed, and in general, less committed and dedicated to their work. (p. 321)

Farber (1984b) further alleges that most “teachers are not burned out, they are worn out. Instead of burning out from their overwork, they turn off to the job and stop attempting to succeed in situations that appear hopeless” (p. 328). Although Farber (1984b) makes the claim that most teachers are worn out rather than burned out, he combines the long-term consequences of “wear out” and burnout by describing the symptoms of the two concepts as being “anger, anxiety, depression, fatigue, boredom, cynicism, substance abuse, psychosomatic symptoms, and marital and family crises” (p. 335).

Jackson, Schwab, and Schuler (1986) explored the effects of burnout in a study of 248 teachers in the New Hampshire chapter of the National Education Association. During this study, the researchers collected data by mail on two separate occasions. The first time, 327 of the 700 teachers sampled “completed and returned a 16 page survey that was mailed to their homes. Of the surveys mailed at Time 2, 277 were completed and returned. Of the 277 respondents, 29 had left their jobs” (Jackson, Schwab, and Schuler, 1986, p. 632). At the conclusion of this study, the researchers empirically established that “burnout scores, notably emotional exhaustion, significantly

predicted respondents' (a) preferred job statuses, (b) subsequent thoughts about leaving their jobs, (c) receipt of training for new careers, and (d) actual job leaving" (Jackson, Schwab, and Schuler, 1986, p. 637).

Freidman (1991) argues that the "overt manifestations of teacher burnout are generally intense reactions of anger, anxiety, restlessness, depression, tiredness, boredom, cynicism, guilt feelings, psychosomatic symptoms, and in extreme cases, nervous breakdown" (p. 325). Pines (1993) believes that

> Once burnout starts, it reduces the individual's motivation for work. The result is a negative loop that with time and with growing levels of burnout turns some people into 'dead wood,' makes some people quit their job, makes other people go back to school so they can climb the administrative ladder and escape the emotionally demanding work, and causes others to leave their chosen careers altogether. (p. 45)

Dworkin (2001) describes how teacher burnout affects human service employees such as teachers.

> When professionals are unable to negotiate agreements on role performances or to determine what are the role expectations within a human service organization, they

> acquire a sense of powerlessness (Shinn, 1982), which soon leads to a sense of meaningless. Soon too, the individual begins to withdraw from social relationships within the organization (isolation) and to question whether continued participation in the organizational role is consistent with their self-conception (estrangement). In addition, the burned out individuals begin to blame their clients, students, or patients for failing to improve. Some may even feel that their clients or students refuse to improve or learn specifically to “spite” the burned out professional. In addition, the burned out professionals often feel that the organization is characterized by a degree of normlessness. That is, they feel that either there are no rules or that following the rules tends to be dysfunctional. (Dworkin, 2001, p. 70)

Factors Leading to Trust

Zand (1972) examined how high-trust and low-trust conditions affect the quality of managerial problem solving. In the study, two managerial groups were given the same problem solving situations, but the researchers gave each group different instructions. One group was exposed to

a situation that described a low trust organization by giving instructions that were worded to “induce a decrease in trust,” while the other group was exposed to a high trust scenario (Zand, 1972, p. 229). Zand (1972) found that the instructions given to each set created trust differences. In the high trust teams, “expressing differences of opinion, stating feelings of encouragement and disappointment, sharing information, exploring ideas outside of one's own function, providing high give and take, and giving support” were evident (Zand, 1972, p. 234). For the low-trust groups, the opposite was implied. Zand (1972) stated that “high trust was the key factor in problem-solving effectiveness” (p. 234).

In 1978, Boss repeated the study by Zand (1972) and found similar results. Like Zand (1972), Boss (1978) divided a group of managers into two groups and gave them directions to a problem-solving task. Directions given to one group were designed to lower trust while the other set of instructions was designed to encourage trust. He found that the group with the trust building instructions was more effective in solving the problem. Moreover,

> When the participants were asked to explain the reasons for the obvious differences in the team

> effectiveness, they offered a number of plausible explanations.... When told of the different instructions, the group reacted with amazement and relief. They were amazed that they had not perceived what seemed to them after the fact to be obvious. (Boss, 1978, p. 331)

Zand’s (1972) and Boss's (1978) research suggest that individuals may have preconceived levels of trust about an environment from information gathered prior to entering into the environment.

Rempel and Holmes (1986) developed a trust scale that measures the ability of an individual to trust others. The scale categorizes and differentiates between high trust, low trust, and hopeful trust profiles. They found that the category to which a person belongs is directly correlated to his past experiences with others (Rempel and Holmes, 1986). High trust individuals believe that both they and the person who they are attempting to trust are motivated by unselfish concerns and will behave positively to each other. Low trust individuals have the greatest number of problems and are the most poorly adjusted and the least satisfied in their relationships with others. Hopeful trust individuals do not want to doubt others, but the risk of

being wrong is too great for them to allow themselves to build trusting relationships confidently (Rempel and Holmes, 1986).

To further provide evidence that supervisors play a significant role in developing trusting relationships, Creed and Miles (1996) argue that

> Within organizations, managers obviously play a central role in determining both the overall level of trust and the specific expectations within given units. Managers initiate most vertical exchanges; thus, whatever level of trust or mistrust is evident in their actions may well be reciprocated. Moreover, managers design reward and control systems that are visible displays of base levels of trust or mistrust within departments or the organization as a whole. (p. 19)

Whitener, et al. (1998) argue that organizational factors (organizational structure, HR policies and procedures, and organizational culture), relational factors (initial interactions, expectations, and costs of exchange), and individual factors (propensity to trust, self-efficacy, and values) all impact managerial trustworthy behavior. They further define managerial

trustworthy behavior as “volitional actions and interactions performed by managers that are necessary though not sufficient to engender employees’ trust in them” (Whitener, et al., 1998, p. 516). Furthermore, Whitener, et al. (1998) claim that “managers who engage in this behavior will increase the likelihood that employees will reciprocate and trust them, providing a necessary, but not sufficient, foundation for employees’ ‘trust-in-supervisors’” (p. 516). According to Whitener, et al. (1998), the five categories of behavior that capture the variety of factors that influence employee’s perception of managerial trustworthiness are:

1. behavioral consistency,
2. behavioral integrity,
3. sharing and delegation of control,
4. communication (e.g., accuracy, explanations, and openness), and
5. demonstration of concern. (p. 516)

Rousseau, et al. (1998) argue that across disciplines, there is agreement on the conditions that must exist for trust to arise, risk and interdependence. Rousseau, et al. (1998) claim that “risk creates an opportunity for trust, which leads to risk taking” (p. 395). Additionally,

Rousseau, et al. (1998) state that interdependence is “where the interests of one party cannot be achieved without reliance upon another” (p. 395).

Mishra and Morrissey (1990) identified four factors that they believed to be the basis for trust: open communication, greater decision power for employees, sharing critical information, and true sharing of perceptions and feelings. Mishra and Morrissey (1990) also identified the advantages of trust in an organizational environment. The advantages are greater predictability; improved communications; dependability and confidence; a reduction in employee turnover; openness, willingness to listen and to accept criticism non-defensively; and a reduction of friction among employees (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990).

In the field of education, Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nanson (1978) claimed that

> Teachers tended to focus more on one-to-one relationships with their principal when they thought about trusting the principal than they did about the principal's organizational responsibilities. That is, it seemed more important to teachers how the principal

> relates to them professionally than how the principal managed the school. (p. 85)

Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nanson (1978) also noted that the top five expectations held by teachers of their principals included credibility, support, fairness, professional openness, and participative decision-making. Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason (1978) further conducted research to collect data that would enable them to clarify the meaning of the word trust and to be able to describe more accurately what teachers mean when they think about trusting principals. In the study, eighty-five teachers who were enrolled in a graduate program were asked to respond to the statement, “I trust my principal.” A total of 179 statements resulted from this procedure. From the responses, the researchers created ten categories and designed a questionnaire to rank them. The researchers asked 167 teachers enrolled in graduate classes to rank order the four dimensions of trust that they felt were most necessary to the maintenance of a satisfactory relationship with their principal. The teachers identified that credibility (22.0%), support (15.1%), fairness (14.5%), and participative decision-making (10.7%) are important to the maintenance of satisfactory relations with their principals

(Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason, 1978). Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason (1978) also concluded that “those things about which people trust others are largely a function of the situation - power relationships, role relationships, the degree of functional interdependency that exists, the nature of the organization’s task, and degree of bureaucratization” (p. 88). In addition, Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason (1978) were able to identify four factors that they believed contributed to trusting the principal: the principal's personality, interpersonal style, professional role expectation, and administrative expectation.

In 1984, Hoy and Kupersmith correlated principal authenticity and faculty trust with those principals. In their study, Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) defined leader authenticity as “a general and consistent pattern of behavior in which subordinates perceive their leader as demonstrating acceptance of organizational and personal responsibility for actions, outcomes, and mistakes; being non-manipulative of subordinates; and exhibiting a salience of self over role” (p. 81). Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) continued by defining faculty trust as a multidimensional construct including trust in the principal, trust in

colleagues, and trust in the school organization. Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) developed three Likert scales to measure each of the factors of faculty trust and used the Leader Authenticity Scale, an 18-item Likert scale developed in a comprehensive factor analytic study of the behavior of elementary principals, to measure principal authenticity. Over 944 teachers from 46 schools completed the survey. Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) found that all dimensions of trust were

> moderately and significantly correlated with each other: trust in principal correlated with trust in colleagues ($r= 0.48$, $p<.01$); trust in principal correlated with trust in organization ($r= 0.69$, $p<.01$); and trust in colleagues correlated with trust in organization ($r= 0.50$, $p<.01$). Moreover, perceived principal authenticity was significantly correlated with each aspect of trust; trust in principal ($r= 0.68$, $p<.01$); trust in colleagues ($r= 0.29$, $p<.05$); trust in organization ($r= 0.55$, $p<.01$). (p.85)

Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) concluded that principals are instrumental in developing an atmosphere of trust.

Kupersmith and Hoy (1989) identified three characteristics that engendered teacher trust: (1) the

principal took responsibility for his or her behavior; (2) the principal was perceived as a person first and one who performed role expectations second and (3) the principal was non-manipulative. These characteristics and behaviors were given the term “principal authenticity”. In another study of 1,083 secondary school teachers in New Jersey, Tarter, Bliss, and Hoy (1989) found that openness was significantly correlated with trust in the principal ($r = .44$, $p<.01$) and that trust in the principal was positively correlated to the principal’s example of hard work and genuine helpfulness to the teachers ($r = .50$, $p<.01$). In addition, trust in the principal was positively correlated to engaged teacher behaviors ($r = .29$, $p<.05$), and negatively correlated to frustrated teacher behaviors ($r = -.23$, $p<.05$) and principal directive leadership ($r = -.22$, $p<.05$). Finally, Tarter, Bliss, and Hoy (1989) discovered that faculty trust in colleagues was significantly correlated with faculty trust in the principal ($r = .43$, $p<.01$).

Busman (1991) examined the influence of authenticity and participation on faculty trust. A random sample of 437 middle school teachers examined the authenticity of leaders and the trust in colleagues, principals, and organizations.

Busman (1991) asked the teachers to rank trust in their colleagues, trust in their principal, and trust in the organization on a scale of one to six. Trust in their colleagues had a mean of 4.68, trust in their principal had a mean of 4.19, and trust in the organization had a mean of 3.40. Busman (1991) also found that the mean score for authenticity was 4.46. Busman (1991) discovered that “as authenticity increased, trust in the organization increased” (p. 13). In addition, “Trust in colleagues is significantly higher between teachers who report high levels of participation in decision-making than teachers who report low levels of participation" (Busman, 1991, p. 13).

MacNeil and Blake (1998) believe that trust between the principal and the teacher is considerably more involved and define trust as the reliability of the relationship that exists between people, developed over time, caused by the behaviors that are formed by the principles and competencies of a person. The definition as proposed by MacNeil and Blake (1998) adds two important distinctions: that trust is a reliable relationship and that trust occurs over a period of time. MacNeil and Blake (1995a) found that certain principles and competencies of principals lead to

behaviors that motivate teachers to trust them. In their study, MacNeil and Blake (1995a) surveyed 129 teachers about the principles, competencies and behaviors of their principals that lead to trusting relationships between themselves and their principals by using a Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree. By using surveys and a factor analysis of the surveys, MacNeil and Blake (1995a) discovered that certain behaviors of principals such as being competent managers, promoting professional growth and curriculum development, and empowering teachers all encouraged teachers to trust their principals. According to the study, “rated highest was when principals are kind toward people and present themselves in a pleasant and cheerful manner” (MacNeil and Blake, 1995a, p. 8). MacNeil and Blake (1995a) also found that principals who are patient with people, thoughtful of people’s feelings, respectful, friendly, and approachable were more likely to build trust with their teachers. In summary, MacNeil and Blake (1995a) found that principals must be kind, considerate, and principled; be competent, use power wisely, make sensible decisions; promote curriculum and

professional growth; be confident and focused and empower teachers.

MacNeil and Ceyanes (1998) argue that in order for teachers to gain the trust of their principals, they must know what to do to encourage their principals to trust them. In a factor analysis survey, they discovered several factors that teachers must display in order to gain the trust of their principals. First, teachers must care about their students. They must be sincere, honest, fair, respectful and committed to educating them. Teachers must then know how to be good teachers. They must be able to influence students in a positive way that encourages them to grow and learn as independent thinkers. Teachers must be friendly, loyal, competent, good workers, able to handle parent communication, and take responsibility for their actions. Teachers who behave in ways that demonstrate these factors should increase trust between themselves and their principals (MacNeil and Ceyanes, 1998).

MacNeil, Spuck, and Ceyanes (1998) explored the relationship between teachers and principals and

> concluded that building trusting relationships between teachers and principals needs to start with principals being kind, considerate, and principled toward

> teachers. Principals need to demonstrate competence, use power wisely, make sensible decisions; promote curriculum and professional growth. They need to be confident and focused and they need to empower teachers. Teachers build trust with their principals when they demonstrate commitment to their students and student learning needs. Teachers need to demonstrate sincerity and honesty toward students. Teachers need to be loyal, supportive and rational and they need to be friendly and cheerful. (p. 9)

According to Bryk and Schneider (2003), interpersonal respect by listening and considering other's views in decision-making, personal regard by extending beyond the formal requirements of a job description, competence in core role responsibilities, and personal integrity are key factors leading to relational trust in schools. Bryk and Schneider (2003) further found in their study of more than 400 Chicago elementary schools during a ten year period, that principals' actions, teachers reaching out to parents, small school size, a stable community, and voluntary associations where at least a modicum of choice exists for both staff and students all foster relational trust.

Factors Leading to Teacher Burnout

Cunningham (1983) asserts that “burnout has no single cause and can be produced by anything to which our stress mechanisms respond excessively or inappropriately” (p. 37). However, many researchers have identified factors that lead to both stress and teacher burnout. This section will identify and discuss the factors that researchers have found that lead to burnout in the workplace.

Pines (1993) claims that “in order to burnout, one has first be ‘on fire.’ A person with no such initial motivation can experience stress, alienation, depression, an existential crisis, or fatigue, but not burnout” (p. 41). Pines (1993) further argues that “the root cause of burnout lies in our need to believe that our lives are meaningful, that the things we do – and consequently we ourselves – are useful and important” (p. 33). Pines (1993) continues his discussion by stating that

> The most emotionally demanding aspect of a work situation is its lack of existential significance. People need meaning in their lives, and the failure to find such meaning will cause burnout. It is not objective failure per se that causes burnout but rather the feeling that one’s efforts are

> insignificant and meaningless. Similarly, it is not objective success per se that prevents burnout but rather the subjective experience of doing something meaningful. (p. 51)

In two samples with a total of 929 subjects, Pines (1993) discovered that burnout was found to be significantly and positively correlated with such work features as overextension (r = .22 and .31), overload (r = .13 and .35), decision load (r = .19 and .30), guilt about not providing adequate service (r = .29 and .42), environmental pressures (r = .27 and .21), bureaucratic pressures (r = .20 and .24), administrative hassles (r = .20 and .26), social overextension (r = .16 and .38), and conflicting demands (r = .27 and .31).

Hallsten (1993) identified three factors contributing to burnout. First, Hallsten (1993) claimed that vulnerability leads to burnout. According to Hallsten (1993),

> The degree of vulnerability might be defined by the following related indices: (1) the degree of instability of self-image and self-esteem, (2) the degree of dependence on self-definitional role enactment and the lack of subsidiary or potential

> roles for self-definition, and (3) the degree of social support outside the present work domain. (p. 101)

Second, Hallsten (1993) argued that goal orientation influences burnout. “The degree of goal orientation can be estimated from the degree of (1) commitment expressed and (2) effort displayed regarding long-term goals” (Hallsten, 1993, p. 101). Finally, Hallsten (1993) stated that perceived environmental congruency is a factor leading to burnout. According to Hallsten (1993), “the degree of perceived environmental congruency corresponds to (1) perceived personal and organizational competencies/resources for attaining organizational goals and professional standards, and (2) perceived social support and shared goals” (p. 102). Hallsten (1993) concluded his discussion by stating that

> The most fundamental factor contributing to burning out in our modern organizations is the gap between organizational means and ends, most notably seen in our human service organizations. Resources to meaningful ends are often missing, which can have well-known, distressing effects (goal displacement, role ambiguity, inconsistent feedback, etc.). This gap

> is especially taxing for vulnerable professionals. (p. 113)

Hobfoll and Freedy (1993) contrasted the differences between stress and burnout by stating that

> As opposed to the extreme demands of major stressors, such as the death of a loved one, burnout is a slower process. It occurs when demands are made over time in a way that tax individuals without proper rewards or resources for addressing demands. (p. 116)

In their discussion, Hobfoll and Freedy (1993) compared the process of burning out with the conservation of resources (COR) theory. According to Hobfoll and Freedy (1993), the

> specific motivation that is basic to COR theory is that individuals strive to obtain and maintain that which they value – these things being termed "resources." When the circumstances at work or otherwise threaten people's obtaining or maintaining resources, stress ensues. Thus, psychological stress occurs during one of three conditions: (1) when resources are threatened, (2) when resources are lost, and (3) when individuals invest resources and do not reap the anticipated level of return. (p. 117)

When Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) surveyed 469 teachers selected randomly from the 1979 – 1980 membership list of the Massachusetts Teachers Association, they found “that there is a statistically significant relationship of perceived role conflict and role ambiguity to teacher burnout after the effects of selected background variables were controlled” (p. 71). In a sample of 398 suburban public school teachers in New York, Farber (1984a) found that “the teachers resented most strongly excessive paperwork, unsuccessful administrative meetings, and the lack of advancement opportunities in teaching” (p. 327).

In 1988, Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, and Bassler surveyed 1,213 elementary teachers from eight districts in a midsouthern state. In this study, Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, and Bassler (1988) found that “greater teacher perceptions of principal support, peer support, family and friends’ support, and parents’ support were associated with lower levels of burnout” (p. 109). When exploring organizational conditions, they reported that “lower levels of organizational rigidity and higher levels of participation were associated with lower levels of burnout” (Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, and Bassler, 1988, p. 110). Individual perception variables indicated that “teachers who found

teaching to be personally rewarding and teachers with a higher sense of efficacy were less likely to report burnout" (Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, and Bassler, 1988, p. 111). In summary, Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, and Bassler (1988) found that organizational rigidity was associated with higher teacher burnout and internal rewards, principal support, peer support, and teacher self-efficacy were all associated with lower levels of teacher burnout. Finally, Brissie, Hoover-Dempsey, and Bassler (1988) suggested "that steps taken to loosen the organizational structure, such as teachers becoming more meaningfully involved in decision making, and the principal's concerted effort to become personally involved in providing support for the teachers could be useful in reducing burnout" (p. 111).

In a study of 1,597 teachers in 78 elementary schools, Freidman (1991) separated high burnout schools and low burnout schools by having teachers complete the Maslach Burnout Inventory. In the second stage of the study, Freidman (1991), selected 12 schools, six from each extreme group, and gathered data from interviews with administrators, teachers, counselors, and other staff members at school, from observations and from minutes of staff meetings. The experienced team of researchers

collected the data and Freidman (1991) made several conclusions. Freidman (1991) claimed that

> Some of the findings in this research may, at first glance, seem counterintuitive. Intuitively and even based on previous research findings, one may assume that clear organizational goals, clear cut organizational hierarchy, and orderly administrative systems of communication within the organization should serve as a warrant, guaranteeing a reassuring climate in which teachers can work pleasantly. In this study, I found that all of the above mentioned variables were associated with a high level of burnout. (p. 331)

In addition, Friedman (1991) suggested that

> in schools in which highly organized hierarchy, well-defined channels of communications, and a clear and tight set of rules and regulations are found, there is a hidden pressure on each individual to adjust to existing standards, without having any influence in defining and establishing them. The rank-and-file teachers in such schools usually have no direct contact with the principal, and they must go through

> recognizable channels, by turning to coordinators and other incumbents. (p. 331)

Finally, Freidman (1991) states that “in a less organized school, behavior patterns are more flexible, and initiatives and spontaneity are more tolerated and common. In those schools, teachers have easier access to administrators and have closer contact with them” (p. 331).

Through a review of the literature, Byrne (1994) identified several organizational factors that lead to burnout; role conflict, role ambiguity, work overload, classroom climate, participation in decision making, and lack of support by administrators. Byrne (1994) further identified two personality factors that increase the level of teacher burnout, locus of control (internal versus external) and self-esteem. In a study of 3,138 teachers, Byrne (1994) tested her findings in the literature and discovered that “the organizational variables of role conflict, work overload, classroom climate, and decision making, and the personality variable of self-esteem, are critical determinants of particular aspects of burnout for teachers regardless of the grade level taught” (p. 668). Byrne (1994) further reported that “the variable of support is evidently provider specific” (p. 668). Next, Byrne

(1994) found that “although role conflict and work overload are important components of the burnout network, their casual pattern differs substantially for teachers of high school students and those teaching student at the lower grades” (p. 668). Finally, according to the results of this study, “the variables of role ambiguity and supervisor support appear not to be casual links to burnout for members of the teaching profession” (Byrne, 1994, p. 668).

Friedman (1995) compiled two studies to examine the unique student behavior patterns that significantly contribute to teacher burnout. In this combination of two studies, Friedman (1995) surveyed 348 teachers and 365 students in Study 1 and 391 teachers in Study 2. Friedman (1995) noted that “five main findings in this research are specifically worth noting: First, student behavior had different effects, in terms of burnout, on teachers functioning within different school cultures” for teachers in secular schools and for teachers in religious schools (p. 287). Friedman (1995) also stated that “the amount of statistical variance in teacher burnout explained by student behavior is, to a certain extent, disappointing” (pp. 287 – 8). According to Friedman (1995), “this finding indicates that although student behavior may be central to

teacher burnout, as believed by teachers, other factors seem to be at work" (p. 288). Second, Friedman (1995) reported that "in general, among the various student behavior patterns, student's disrespect (to their peers and to their teachers) was the pattern that best predicted burnout in teachers" (p. 288).

> Third, teachers possessing different student control ideologies did not differ in their self-reported exposure to different typical student behavior patterns. Fourth, a link existed between teacher ideology and what affects teacher burnout: Teachers with a humanistic orientation to pupil control were mainly affected by disrespect, whereas teachers with custodial orientation to student control were affected mainly by inattentiveness. Fifth, male teachers' burnout was significantly affected solely by inattentiveness, whereas female teachers' burnout was significantly affected by disrespect. (Friedman, 1995, p. 288)

Abel and Sewell (1999) surveyed 98 secondary school teachers from Georgia and North Carolina to examine "the differences between rural and urban secondary teachers'

sources of stress and symptoms of burnout” (p. 289). In the study, Abel and Sewell (1999) found

> significantly greater self-reported stress for urban versus rural school teachers from (a) poor working conditions, that is, inadequate salary and poor promotion prospects, lack of recognition for good teaching, and lack of or inadequate equipment and resources for teaching and (b) poor staff relations, that is, lack of friendly atmosphere among staff and lack of support among colleagues and from the administration-principal. (p. 292)

Furthermore, Abel and Sewell (1999) discovered that

> Self-reported stress from pupil misbehavior and time pressures was significantly greater than stress from poor working conditions and poor staff relations for both rural and urban school teachers. However, rural school teachers experienced significantly greater stress from pupil misbehavior and time pressures versus working conditions and staff relations than urban school teachers. (p. 292)

In other words, “time pressures and poor working conditions were the best predictors of burnout for rural teachers and pupil misbehavior and poor working conditions were the best

predictors of burnout for urban school teachers" (Abel and Sewell, 1999, p. 292).

Impact of Trusting Relationships on Teacher Burnout

Abel and Sewell (1999) argue that "public school administrators need to focus on their teachers' levels of stress and symptoms of burnout" (p. 287). Farber (1984b) discusses the impact of teacher burnout on relationships with principals by stating that

> Administrators and parents cannot be unaware of the phenomenon of teacher burnout; indeed, under ideal conditions both groups would be working with teachers to reduce stress and facilitate optimal working conditions for teachers. Yet, in both suburban and urban schools, administrators and parents are perceived by most teachers as contributing more to the problems that teachers face than to the help they need. (p. 331)

In a study of 693 public school teachers in New York, Farber (1984b) found that

> in suburban schools, 86.9 percent of teachers surveyed have never or rarely felt that administrative meetings prove helpful in solving the problems that teachers face, 63.4 percent have never or rarely felt that they

> received support or encouragement from their principals, 60.8 percent have never or rarely felt a 'sense of community' among the faculty and administrators of their school, and 66.1 percent have never or only rarely felt that parents have made things easier for them. (p. 331)

In addition, Farber (1984b), found that

> These figures are even more startling among teachers in urban schools: 90.6 percent of urban teachers have never or rarely felt that administrative meetings are helpful, 76.7 percent have never or rarely felt supported by their principals, 69.2 percent have never or only rarely felt a "sense of community" in their school, and 75.5 percent have never or only rarely felt that parents are making things easier for them. (p. 331)

Cherniss (1992) discusses the critical impact of the relationship with the principal in affecting teacher burnout when he quotes two of the three teachers who scored the maximum score for early career burnout in his study. Referring to the comments from personal interviews, Cherniss (1992) reported how the first subject complained about the way her principal treated her. She was

particularly upset with the way her work was substantially increased at the last minute in addition to a new class. This teacher made comments such as, “Bill (the principal) put the screws to me,” and further described her job as a “day-to-day struggle” (Cherniss, 1992, p. 5). The second teacher who scored the maximum score for early burnout actually left his job. The teacher said that his new job was better. According to him, the new supervisor was “so open that it just made the job easier, because you could talk to him as a person, rather than as a superior. And I just really liked his creativity, his openness, and his honesty” (Cherniss, 1992, p. 8). Research establishes that many of the characteristics described by this teacher lead to stronger trusting relationships between principals and teachers. The principal was perceived as a person first and one who performed role expectations second (Kupersmith and Hoy, 1989). The principal is thoughtful of people’s feelings (MacNeil and Blake, 1995b), displays open communication (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990), and exhibits openness (Blumburg, Greenfield, and Nanson, 1978). If a principal who displays these characteristics reduces teacher burnout and strengthens trusting relationships, one

can argue that a correlation between trusting relationships with the principal and teacher burnout exists.

Whitener, et al. (1998) “argue that managers’ actions and behaviors provide the foundation for trust and that it is actually management’s responsibility to take the first step and initiate trusting relationships” (p. 514). Principals must accept the responsibility for developing trusting relationships and reducing teacher burnout.

Summary of Trust and Burnout

The review of the literature demonstrates that trust is vital in developing successful relationships. Successful relationships can lead to a successful and productive work atmosphere. Principals and teachers must learn, develop, and maintain trusting relationships in order to run effective and efficient schools. By working together and developing trust, educators can create a powerful educational system that will prepare students for the future. Mutual trust is vital for the success of any relationship in today’s society. By incorporating past research and continuing research, educators can continue to develop strong successful relationships, which can help them to become more professional and competent.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the survey research methodology for this study. Used to obtain standardized information from 315 teachers from selected Texas public schools, the data collected reflects the views of an entire population. This chapter will discuss the study population, the description of the respondents, the instrumentation, the procedures, the data analysis, the research questions and the hypothesis.

Population

The population in this study included teachers from selected Texas public schools. The original sample in the study encompassed three high schools containing 331 teachers, six middle schools containing 337 teachers, and seven elementary schools containing 380 teachers for a total of 16 campuses and 1,048 teachers. The researcher surveyed the entire population of identified teachers.

Description of the Respondents

Three hundred and seventy-three out of 1,048 teachers responded to the survey for a return rate of 36 percent. The researcher removed 58 responses due to duplication, missing data, and/or respondent error. Therefore, the

researcher utilized 315 of the responses with a final return rate of 30 percent. Table 3.1 documents the descriptive measures of selected demographic variables among teachers in selected Texas public schools.

Table 3.1 - Descriptive Measures of Selected Demographic Variables Among Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

Variable	Frequency						
	Gender						
	Male			Female		No response	Total
Teacher Gender	55			257		3	315
Principal Gender	218			94		3	315
	Age Groups						
	< 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 +	No Response	Total
Teacher Age	13	104	88	81	26	3	315
Principal Age	0	30	165	91	21	8	315
	Race						
	Caucasian	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Other	No response	Total
Teacher Race	279	9	8	3	4	12	315
Principal Race	239	25	36	1	5	9	315
	Years Experience						
	1 - 7	8 - 14	15 - 21	22 - 28	29 +	No response	Total
Teacher Years Experience	118	83	57	37	16	4	315
	Years Worked with Principal						
	0 - 1	2 - 4	5 - 10	11 - 15	16 +	No response	Total
Teacher Worked with Principal	105	144	55	3	1	7	315

The population included 55 males (17%), 257 females (82%), and three (1%) teachers who provided no response. The subjects included 13 teachers under 25 years old, 104 teachers from 26 to 35 years old, 88 teachers from ages 36 to 45 years old, 81 teachers from ages 46 to 56 years old, and 26 teachers that were 56 years of age or older. Two hundred and seventy-nine teachers reported their race to be Caucasian, nine African American, eight Hispanic, three Asian, four other, and 12 provided no response. The teachers in the sample reported the following number of years experience; 118 with one to seven years experience, 83 with eight to fourteen years experience, 57 with sixteen to twenty-one years experience, 37 with twenty-two to twenty eight years experience, 16 with twenty-nine or more years experience, and four teachers who did not respond. Finally, the teachers in the sample indicated that they worked for their principals zero to one year (105), two to four years (144), five to ten years (55), eleven to fifteen years (3), sixteen years or more (1), and seven did not respond.

In addition, summary of the results reported by the teachers indicated that 218 of the teachers (69%) have a male principal, 94 of the teachers (30%) have a female

principal, and three (1%) did not respond. The subjects reported that zero teachers have a principal under twenty-five years old, 30 teachers have a principal from age twenty-six to thirty-five years old, 165 teachers have a principal from age thirty-six to forty five years old, 91 teachers have a principal from age forty-six to fifty five years old, 21 teachers have a principal fifty-six or more years old, and eight teachers did not respond. Finally, 239 of the teachers (76%) identified their principals as Caucasian, 25 (8%) African American, 36 (11%) Hispanic, one (0.3%) Asian, five (1.7%) other, and nine (3%) provided no response.

Instrumentation

The researcher used two questionnaires for the analysis in this study. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2002) developed the first questionnaire, the Omnibus T-Scale, to determine the level of faculty trust in the principal (See Appendix A). The entire survey contains twenty-six Likert items relating to trusting relationships between teachers and principals, teachers and colleagues, and teachers and clients (students and parents). Eight of the items specifically measure the level of trust between the teacher and the principal. The researcher selected these eight

items for the analytical purposes of this study. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2002) tested the questionnaire for reliability and validity and found the instrument to be reliable and valid. Specifically, the alpha coefficients for reliability “were high in both samples - Trust in the principal (.98), trust in colleagues (.93), and trust in clients (.94). Moreover, the omnibus subscales correlated very highly with the longer subscale versions for both samples – none were lower than .96” (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2002, p. 21). To determine the Teacher Trust in the Principal score (TP), the researcher utilized questions numbered one, four, seven, nine, eleven, fifteen, eighteen, and twenty-three of the Omnibus T-Scale. The researcher scored the Likert scale items from one to six, with one being strongly disagree and six being strongly agree. The researcher then assigned values to each of the responses (1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=5, and 6=6). Three of the items measuring the teacher trust in the principal (items four, eleven, and twenty-three) were reversed scored (1=6, 2=5, 3=4, 4=3, 5=2, 6=1). After calculating the sum of the responses, the researcher divided the sum by the total number of items (eight) to obtain the Teacher Trust in the Principal (TP) score. Assuming that the respondents in the

survey are normally distributed, the researcher would expect that a score of 1.0 would be three standard deviations from the mean, that a score of 6.0 would be three standard deviations from the mean, and that the mean would be 3.5. Dworkin (1987) developed the second questionnaire, the Teacher Burnout Scale (Alienation Burnout), to measure the level of teacher burnout (See Appendix A). The Dworkin Teacher Burnout Scale (Lester and Bishop, 2000, p. 313) contains ten items measuring the five areas of alienation (powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, and estrangement). The researcher scored the ten items on a five-point Likert scale from +2 equaling strongly agree to <2> equaling strongly disagree with the following assigned values: 1=<2>, 2=<1>, 3=0, 4=1, and 5=2. The Teacher Burnout Scale produced a reliability coefficient of 0.83 from an original sample of 3,277 public school teachers from Texas and a second sample of 1,060 Texas public school teachers (Lester and Bishop, 2000, p. 313). To obtain the Teacher Burnout score for each teacher, the researcher summed the ten individual scores and divided the sum by ten resulting in a single positive or negative score. Of the ten items in the Dworkin Teacher Burnout Scale, five were reversed scored,

(1=2, 2=1, 3=0, 4=<1>, and 5=<2>, items two, four, six, nine, and ten. Once again, assuming a normal distribution of scores, the researcher would expect a score of negative two to be three standard deviations from the mean, a score of positive two being three standard deviations above the mean, and a mean score of zero.

Added to the combined instruments were questions relating to teacher age, teacher gender, teacher race, years experience as a teacher, and the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal in order to complete a demographic analysis. Also added to the instrument were questions relating to the principal's gender, age, and race.

Procedures

The researcher contacted the superintendent and/or principal of the identified schools to obtain permission to survey the teachers on each of the campuses. The researcher utilized both e-mail communications and telephone conversations to create the initial contact. The researcher provided each principal and/or superintendent with a brief verbal explanation of the purpose and methodology for the study and answered any questions that the principal and/or superintendent posed. Of the 18 contacts, two were

superintendents and 16 were campus principals. Three campus principals and one superintendent declined to participate in the study. The superintendent and one principal who declined to participate explained that their campus teachers recently completed an Organizational Health Instrument, and they felt as though the content of this survey was too similar to the Organizational Health Instrument to expect them to participate. The other two principals who declined to participate in the study stated that the timing of the survey was not optimal because of other campus activities. Of the 18 contacts, 14 agreed to participate in the study, for a participation rate of 78%. For reasons unknown to the researcher, three campus contacts who agreed to participate in the survey did not forward the e-mail to their teachers. Therefore, 11 of the 18 contacts representing 16 campuses participated in the study for a contact participation rate of 61%. The 16 campuses in the sample were from three school districts located in the Greater Houston area.

After establishing the campus contacts and the sample population, the researcher created a web-site containing the instrument and the instructions on how to complete the survey. The researcher sent an e-mail containing the survey

web-site link to a campus contact identified by the superintendents and/or principals. The researcher asked the campus contacts via e-mail to distribute the electronic link to the teachers on the respective campuses for completion of the survey (Appendix B). One superintendent asked the researcher to delay the distribution of the web-based survey to six campuses by twelve days beyond the distribution date of the other participating campuses for undisclosed district purposes. Due to concerns about obtaining an acceptable return rate from the entire teacher population prior to the end of the school year, the researcher decided to distribute the survey in two cycles. The first cycle included thirteen campuses with 1,065 teachers. The second cycle included the remaining six campuses with 294 teachers. Three of the campus principals who committed to participating in the survey did not forward the e-mail to their teachers for reasons that the researcher was not able to determine. Therefore, the final sample included 16 campuses with a total population of 1,048 teachers.

After electronically monitoring the responses from each campus in the first cycle, the researcher contacted the campus contacts for the campuses that had not reached

the acceptable return rate and encouraged further participation on the same day that the researcher distributed the instrument to the six campuses in the second cycle (Appendix B). Due to school district networking problems and computer viruses, the first cycle of surveying produced only 51 responses. By the completion of the second cycle, 373 teachers responded to the survey for a return rate of 36%. However, the researcher was able to score only 315 of the surveys due to duplication, missing data, and respondent error, thus producing a final return rate of 30%.

Data Analysis

The researcher collected, analyzed, and reported data for a population of teachers in selected Texas public schools. The researcher used quantitative techniques to report the results of the study. Analysis and interpretation of the data follows the principles described in Social Statistics (Fox, 1998), Statistical Methods for Psychology (Howell, 2002), and Tests and Assessment (Walsh and Betz, 2001). For example, when determining the strength of the association between the variables, the researcher used the standards set forth by Fox (1998). According to Fox (1998), “as a rough rule of thumb, differences less

than 10 percentage points are usually regarded as small, differences between 10 and 30 percentage points are moderate, and differences greater than about 30 percentage points are large” (p. 118). To perform the cross tabulations for teacher trust, the researcher divided the Teacher Trust in the Principal scores into three categories; High Trust (5.1 through 6.0), Moderate Trust (2.6 through 5.0), and Low Trust (1 through 2.5). In addition, to perform the cross tabulations for teacher burnout, the researcher divided the Teacher Burnout scores into three categories; Low Burnout (0.6 through 2.0), Moderate Burnout (-0.4 through 0.5), and High Burnout (-2 through – 0.5). By combining the results from the cross tabulations and Pearson product-moment correlations, the researcher determined the strength of the association and the relationship between the variables. Finally, the researcher utilized descriptive and inferential numerical analysis and graphic techniques, such as tables, to report the findings.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

The researcher will address the following research questions during this study:

1. Is there a relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools?
2. Do other variables, such as demographic factors, mediate the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools?

Given the preceding discussion of teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout, the main hypothesis in this study is that as trust increases, burnout decreases. In a more technical explanation, teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout should be inversely correlated.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

One purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout. As teacher trust in the principal goes up, does teacher burnout go down? The second purpose of this study was to determine whether demographic variables such as teacher gender, teacher age, teacher experience, principal age, and principal gender influence the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout. This chapter presents the results of the data analysis. Table 4.1 displays the descriptive statistics for teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout.

Table 4.1 - Descriptive Statistics for the Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

	Trust Score	Burnout Score
N	315	315
Mean	4.4488	.5686
Median	4.8750	.7000
Mode	5.00	.80[a]
Std. Deviation	1.23672	.68300
Minimum	1.00	-2.00
Maximum	6.00	2.00

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Relationship Between Teacher Trust in the Principal and Teacher Burnout

As teacher trust in the principal increases, does teacher burnout decrease? Table 4.2 is a cross-tabulation of teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal. The data indicates a moderate to strong association with teacher burnout and teacher trust in the principal. Teachers who indicated low trust in the principal are about 28 percent more likely to experience high teacher burnout. In fact, out of the 315 teachers who completed this survey, not one teacher who reported high teacher trust in the principal scored high for teacher burnout.

Table 4.2 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Teacher Trust in the Principal		
Teacher Burnout	High Trust 5.1 through 6.0	Moderate Trust 2.6 through 5.0	Low Trust 1.0 through 2.5
Low Burnout (0.6 - 2.0)	82.9	43.8	15.6
Moderate Burnout (-0.4 - 0.5)	17.1	46.9	56.3
High Burnout (-2 through -0.5)	0	9.4	28.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(123)	(160)	(32)

The chi square for this comparison was 78.13 with 4 degrees of freedom which is statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficient was 0.446, thus suggesting a strong relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout.

The results of the cross tabulation are also corroborated by the Pearson product-moment correlation. Just as hypothesized, the researcher found a strong, positive correlation of 0.61 between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout, which is significant at the $p<0.01$ level for a two-tailed test for significance. Table 4.3 displays the results of the correlation among Teacher Trust in the Principal scores and Teacher Burnout scores as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools.

Table 4.3 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

Variables		Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust Score		1	.609**
Burnout Score		.609**	1
	(N)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In sum, the cross tabulation and the Pearson product-moment correlation both showed a strong association and a strong, positive correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout. Nevertheless, is this relationship genuine? For example, could the strong correlation we see in the data be a result of a spurious relationship? Given a relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout, is this relationship mediated by other variables such as demographic factors? In other words, do such things as teacher age, experience, and ethnicity affect the trust-burnout relationship? The subsequent sections will explore the effects of demographic variables on the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Teacher Gender

Could the relationship that we see between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout be influenced by teacher gender? There is a growing literature on how women respond differently or view things differently than men. Do these gender differences appear in the trust-burnout relationship? Table 4.4 suggests that there is a small but significant association for teacher burnout by teacher

trust in the principal controlling for teacher gender. Women who report low trust in the principal are about 8 percent more likely to fall into the high burnout category than men. Therefore, teacher gender seems to influence the strength of the teacher trust-burnout relationship slightly.

Table 4.4 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Teacher Gender as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Teacher Gender					
	Female			Male		
	Teacher Trust in the Principal			Teacher Trust in the Principal		
Teacher Burnout	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
Low	81.0	43.4	17.4	94.4	46.4	11.1
Moderate	19.0	47.3	52.2	5.6	42.9	66.7
High	0	9.3	30.4	0	10.7	22.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(105)	(129)	(23)	(18)	(28)	(9)

The chi square for this comparison was 60.74 with 4 degrees of freedom for female teachers and 19.44 with 4 degrees of freedom for male teachers, which are both statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.437 for female teachers and 0.511 for male teachers, thus suggesting a strong

relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for teacher gender.

Table 4.5 shows the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and teacher gender. The correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher gender was -.10, and for teacher burnout and teacher gender, the correlation was 0.01. In other words, teacher gender is not related to teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout, thus ruling out the possibility that the observed relationship was being caused by a relationship between teacher burnout and/or teacher trust in the principal and teacher gender.

Table 4.5 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Teacher Gender as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Teacher Gender
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Teacher Gender		-.092	.009	1
	(N)	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Finally, does the correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout differ by teacher gender?

Table 4.6 displays the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by teacher gender. The researcher found Pearson product-moment correlations of 0.59 for female teachers and 0.72 for male teachers.

Table 4.6 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by Teacher Gender as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Teacher Gender			
		Female		Male	
		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust Score		1	.591**	1	.720**
Burnout Score		.591**	1	.720**	1
	(N)	(257)	(257)	(55)	(55)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Although both female and male teachers displayed a strong, positive, significant correlation between trust in the principal and teacher burnout, males appeared to have a stronger correlation. This difference in the correlation supports the finding in the cross-tabulation. Therefore, according to this study, teacher gender appears to have a slight effect on the teacher trust-burnout relationship found in this research.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Teacher Age

After finding that the teacher gender slightly influences the trust-burnout relationship, the next question to ask is whether the teacher's age influences the teacher trust-burnout relationship. Table 4.7 displays the results of the multivariate cross-tabulation indicating that teacher age displays a moderate effect on the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

Table 4.7 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Teacher Age as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Teacher Age					
	35 years and under		36 - 45 years		46 years and older	
Teacher Burnout	Teacher Trust in the Principal		Teacher Trust in the Principal		Teacher Trust in the Principal	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Low	83.8	14.3	84.6	10.0	80.9	25.0
Moderate	16.2	50.0	15.4	60.0	19.1	62.5
High	0	35.7	0	30.0	0	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(37)	(14)	(39)	(10)	(47)	(8)

Teachers 35 years and younger reporting low trust in the principal were approximately 23 percent more likely to

report high teacher burnout compared to teachers 46 years and older.

The chi square for this comparison was 29.70 for teachers 35 years old and under, 28.24 for teachers 36 years to 45 years, and 23.95 for teachers 46 years and older with 4 degrees of freedom, which are all statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.450 for teachers 35 years old and under, 0.493 for teachers 36 years to 45 years, and 0.428 for teachers 46 years and older, thus suggesting a strong relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for teacher age.

Table 4.8 displays the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and teacher age and shows a correlation of 0.11 for teacher trust in the principal and teacher age and 0.09 for teacher burnout and teacher age.

Table 4.8 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Teacher Age as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Teacher Age
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Teacher Age		.110	.093	1
	N	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Therefore, in this sample, no relationship existed between teacher trust in the principal and teacher age or teacher burnout with teacher age. In other words, teacher age was not directly correlated to either teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout. However, this finding does not mean that teacher age does not influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

To further examine the potential effects of teacher age on the teacher trust-burnout relationship, the researcher completed a correlation analysis among teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout scores by teacher age. Table 4.9 illustrates a difference in the correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by teacher age. The Pearson product-moment correlation was 0.66 for teachers 35 years of age and younger, 0.58 for teachers 36 to 45 years of age, and 0.59 for teachers 46 years of age or older.

Table 4.9 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by Teacher Age as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Teacher Age					
		35 years and under		36 - 45 years		46 years and older	
		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust		1	.659**	1	.579**	1	.587**
Burnout		.659**	1	.579**	1	.587**	1
	(N)	(117)	(117)	(88)	(88)	(107)	(107)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Once again, teachers 35 years and under displayed a stronger correlation than the older teachers. Therefore, according to the complete analysis, teacher age appears to moderately affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Teacher Race

The researcher next compared teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for teacher race. In other words, does teacher race influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship? Due to the low respondent rate for African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race teachers in this study, the researcher was unable to complete a cross tabulation analysis controlling for teacher race. However, the Pearson product-moment

correlations unveiled some potential effects of teacher race on the trust-burnout relationship.

In the first analysis, the researcher investigated the question as to whether or not teacher race influences either teacher burnout or teacher trust in the principal directly. The correlation was 0.02 for teacher trust in the principal and teacher race and 0.04 for teacher burnout and teacher race. Table 4.10 displays the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and teacher race.

Table 4.10 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Teacher Race as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Teacher Race
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Teacher Race		.015	.042	1
	(N)	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Next, the researcher completed a correlation analysis between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by teacher race, Table 4.11. In other words, does the trust-burnout relationship differ by the teacher’s race?

Table 4.11 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by Teacher Race as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

Teacher Race[a]	Variables		Trust Score	Burnout Score
Caucasian	Trust Score		1	.600**
	Burnout Score		.600**	1
		(N)	(279)	(279)
African American	Trust Score		1	.726*
	Burnout Score		.726*	1
		(N)	(9)	(9)
Hispanic	Trust Score		1	.701
	Burnout Score		.701	1
		(N)	(8)	(8)
Asian	Trust Score		1	.970
	Burnout Score		.970	1
		(N)	(3)	(3)
Other	Trust Score		1	.469
	Burnout Score		.469	1
		(N)	(4)	(4)
No response	Trust Score		1	.697*
	Burnout Score		.697*	1
		(N)	(12)	(12)

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

a. The cell size is too small for African American, Hispanic, Asian, and Other race teachers to make any conclusive determinations.

The results of the analysis showed that the correlation among teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout was 0.60 for Caucasians, 0.73 for African Americans, 0.70 for Hispanics, and 0.97 for Asians. Although the results initially appear to signify a stronger relationship between teacher trust in the principal and

teacher burnout with Asians, African Americans, and Hispanics, the researcher was cautious in drawing any conclusions based on the results due to the small number of respondents in those three categories. As indicated in Table 4.11, only the results for Caucasians and African Americans were significant with Caucasians being significant at the $p<0.01$ level and African Americans being significant at the $p<0.05$ level. The small numbers of teachers who were African American, Hispanic, Asian or other taking the survey was not large enough to make any conclusive determinations.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for the Teacher's Years Experience

To continue the process of validating the relationship between teacher burnout and teacher trust in the principal, the researcher analyzed the effects of the teacher's years experience on the trust-burnout relationship. In other words, does the teacher's years experience strengthen or weaken the trust-burnout relationship? Table 4.12 exhibits the multivariate cross-tabulation for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal, controlling for teacher experience. The results of this analysis indicated that the teacher's years experience affects the teacher trust-

burnout relationship for teachers reporting low trust in the principal. For example, teachers with 1 to 14 years experience reporting low trust in the principal were approximately 26 percent more likely to report high teacher burnout than teachers with 15 or more years experience.

Table 4.12 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Teacher Experience as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Teaching Experience					
	1 to 14 years			15 years and above		
Teacher Burnout	Teacher Trust in the Principal			Teacher Trust in the Principal		
	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
Low	83.6	46.4	18.2	81.8	37.8	10.0
Moderate	16.4	42.0	45.5	18.2	57.8	80.0
High	0	11.6	36.4	0	4.4	10.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(67)	(112)	(22)	(55)	(45)	(10)

The chi square for this cross-tabulation was 46.99 with 4 degrees of freedom for teachers with 1 to 14 years experience and 30.70 with 4 degrees of freedom for teachers with 15 or more years, which are both statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.435 for teachers with 1 to 14 years experience and 0.467 for teachers with 15 or more years

experience, thus suggesting a strong relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for teacher experience.

The Pearson product-moment correlations confirm the findings from the cross-tabulation. Table 4.13 displays the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and teacher experience. In this analysis, the correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teaching experience was 0.11 and was 0.09 for teacher burnout and teaching experience. Therefore, this analysis showed no relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teaching experience or teacher burnout and teaching experience.

Table 4.13 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Teacher Experience as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Teaching Experience
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Teaching Experience		.107	.091	1
	(N)	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

However, an analysis comparing the differences in the correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by the number of years experience of the teacher corroborates the findings from the cross-tabulation. Table 4.14 portrays the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation among the teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout scores by the teacher's years experience.

Table 4.14 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by the Teacher's Years Experience as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Years Teaching Experience			
		1 to 14 years		15 years and above	
		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust Score		1	.626**	1	.563**
Burnout Score		.626**	1	.563**	1
	(N)	(201)	(201)	(110)	(110)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout differs by the teacher's experience. The correlation among trust in the principal and teacher burnout by the teacher's years experience was 0.63 for teachers with 1 to 14 years experience and was 0.56 for

teachers with 15 or more years experience. The correlations were significant at the $p<0.01$ level for the two-tailed test of significance for both groups of teachers.

Therefore, in this study, teaching experience moderately affects the teacher trust-burnout relationship. In addition, this effect appears to be slightly stronger with a decrease in the teacher's experience. In other words, teachers with less experience tend to be affected more by teacher trust in the principal as it relates to teacher burnout.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for the Number of Years That the Teacher Has Worked with the Principal

Next, the researcher tested the teacher trust-burnout relationship using a multivariate cross-tabulation controlling for the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal. In this analysis, teachers who reported low trust in the principal were approximately 29 percent more likely to score high on teacher burnout if they had worked with the principal for 5 years or more than those teachers who had worked with their principal for 4 or less years. In other words, if a teacher did not trust their principal, the teacher appears to become more burned

out the longer that that teacher continues to work with the principal. Table 4.15 displays the results of the multivariate cross-tabulation for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal, controlling for the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal.

Table 4.15 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for the Number of Years That the Teacher Has Worked with the Principal as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Years Worked with Principal					
	4 years and under			5 years and above		
	Teacher Trust in the Principal			Teacher Trust in the Principal		
Teacher Burnout	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
Low	82.8	47.7	16.7	82.1	26.1	12.5
Moderate	17.2	44.7	62.5	17.9	60.9	37.5
High	0	7.6	20.8	0	13.0	50.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(93)	(132)	(24)	(28)	(23)	(8)

The chi square for this comparison was 50.77 for teachers who have worked with their principals for 4 years and under and 29.90 for teachers who have worked for their principals for 5 years or more. With 4 degrees of freedom, both are statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.412 for teachers who have worked with their principals for 4 years and less

and 0.580 for teachers who have worked for their principals for 5 years or more, thus suggesting a strong relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal.

The Pearson product-moment correlations substantiate the findings from the cross tabulation. Table 4.16 exhibits the results from the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal.

Table 4.16 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and the Years That the Teacher Has Worked with the Principal as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Years Worked with Principal
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Years Worked with Principal		.037	-.001	1
	(N)	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation between teacher trust in the principal and the number of years that the teacher has worked with

the principal was 0.04. In addition, the correlation between teacher burnout and the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal was 0.0. Therefore, in this study, no relationship existed between teacher trust in the principal and the number of years that the teacher has worked with their principal or teacher burnout and the number of years that the teacher worked with the principal.

Finally, a correlation among teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal suggested that differences between the correlations existed between the teacher trust-burnout relationships when comparing to the number of years that the teacher worked with the principal. In this analysis, the researcher discovered that teachers who worked with their principals for four years or less scored a correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout of 0.58 and teachers working with their principals for five or more years scored a correlation of 0.70. Table 4.17 shows the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation among the teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout scores by the number of years the teacher has worked with the principal.

Table 4.17 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by the Number of Years That the Teacher Has Worked with the Principal as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Years Worked with Principal			
		4 years and under		5 years and above	
		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust Score		1	.583**	1	.700**
Burnout Score		.583**	1	.700**	1
	(N)	(249)	(249)	(59)	(59)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Both categories reported a significant correlation at the $p<0.01$ level for the two-tailed test of significance. The findings of this analysis also confirm the results of the cross-tabulation. Teachers who have worked with their principal for more than five years display a stronger correlation than teachers who have worked with their principal for four or less years.

The differences found in this portion of the analysis are interesting and informative. Both the cross-tabulation and the Pearson product-moment correlations suggest that the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal strongly influences the trust-burnout relationship. More specifically, if a teacher does not

trust the principal, the likelihood that the teacher will become burned out will increase the longer that the teacher continues to work with the principal.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for the Gender of the Teacher's Principal

After completing the analysis for the demographic variables relating to the teacher, the researcher investigated the demographic factors relating to the principal; principal gender, principal age, and principal race. First, does the gender of the teacher's principal influence the trust-burnout relationship? Table 4.18 presents the multivariate cross-tabulation for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal, controlling for principal gender.

Table 4.18 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Principal Gender as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Principal Gender					
	Male			Female		
Teacher Burnout	Teacher Trust in the Principal			Teacher Trust in the Principal		
	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
Low	80.0	42.1	8.3	88.4	48.8	37.5
Moderate	20.0	46.5	62.5	11.6	46.5	37.5
High	0	11.4	29.2	0	4.7	25.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(80)	(114)	(24)	(43)	(43)	(8)

In this analysis, teachers with male principals who reported low trust in their principal were only about 4 percent more likely to score high on teacher burnout than those teachers with female principals.

The chi square for this comparison was 53.87 with 4 degrees of freedom for teachers with male principals and 25.06 with 4 degrees of freedom for teachers with female principals, which are both statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.445 for teachers with male principals and 0.459 for teachers with female principals, thus suggesting a strong relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for principal gender.

Next, the researcher examined the Pearson product-moment correlation between teacher trust in the principal, teacher burnout, and the gender of the teacher’s principal. The correlation for teacher burnout and principal gender was 0.14 while the correlation for teacher trust in the principal and principal gender was 0.09. Therefore, in this analysis, the researcher found no relationship between teacher burnout and principal gender or teacher trust in the principal and principal gender. Table 4.19 portrays the

Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and principal gender.

Table 4.19 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Principal Gender as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

	Trust Score	Burnout Score	Principal Gender
Trust Score	1		
Burnout Score	.609**	1	
Principal Gender	.089	.140*	1
	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Finally, the researcher explored the differences in the correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by principal gender. Table 4.20 suggests that the difference between teachers with male and female principals is minimal. The correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout was 0.63 for teachers with male principals and 0.57 for teachers with female principals. Both correlations were significant at the $p<0.01$ level for the two-tailed test of significance.

Table 4.20 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by Principal Gender as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Principal Gender			
		Male		Female	
		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust Score		1	.626**	1	.565**
Burnout Score		.626**	1	.565**	1
	(N)	(218)	(218)	(94)	(94)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation confirm the findings from the cross-tabulation. The gender of the teacher's principal does not appear to affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship much at all, if any.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for the Age of the Teacher's Principal

Next, the question as to whether the age of the teacher's principal affects the teacher trust-burnout relationship was addressed. In this analysis, no teachers with a principal under 35 years of age reported high burnout. In contrast, 30.8 percent of teachers with a principal 46 years and older reported high teacher burnout. In other words, in this study, teachers with a principal 46 years and older reporting low trust in the principal were

approximately 31 percent more likely to be burnout out than teachers with principals under 35 years of age. However, this difference could be a result of the smaller number of respondents who have a principal under 35 years of age. Only fifteen respondents reported a principal under 35 years of age, and only three were in the category of low trust in the principal. Table 4.21 presents teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal, controlling for principal age.

Table 4.21 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Principal Age as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Principal Age					
	35 years and under		36 - 45 years		46 years and older	
Teacher Burnout	Teacher Trust in the Principal		Teacher Trust in the Principal		Teacher Trust in the Principal	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Low	83.3	33.3	81.9	13.3	86.8	7.7
Moderate	16.7	66.7	18.1	53.3	13.2	61.5
High	0	0	0	33.3	0	30.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(12)	(3)	(72)	(15)	(38)	(13)

The chi square for this comparison was 4.16 for teachers with principals 35 years old and under with 4 degrees of freedom, which was not statistically significant. However, chi squares of 45.48 for teachers

with principals 36 years to 45 years and 36.42 for teachers with principals 46 years and older with 4 degrees of freedom were both statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.349 for teachers with principals 35 years old and under, 0.465 for teachers with principals 36 years to 45 years, and 0.495 for teachers with principals 46 years and older, thus suggesting a strong relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for the age of the teacher's principal.

To further discover the potential effects of the principal's age on the teacher trust-burnout relationship, the researcher conducted a Pearson product-moment correlation for the variables. Table 4.22 poses the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and principal age. The correlation between teacher trust in the principal and the age of the principal was -0.06 and between teacher burnout and the age of the principal was -0.05. In other words, there is no relationship between teacher trust in the principal and principal age or teacher burnout and principal age in this study.

Table 4.22 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Principal Age as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Principal Age
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Principal Age		-.046	-.056	1
	(N)	(315)	(315)	(315)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Supporting the assumption that the small number of respondents with principals under 35 years of age may have affected the results of the cross-tabulation, the Pearson product-moment correlations revealed that the principal's age did not significantly change the correlation between trust in the principal and teacher burnout. Teachers with principals 35 years and under displayed a correlation of 0.62. The correlation for teachers with a principal 36 to 45 years was 0.61, and for teachers with a principal 46 years and older, the correlation was 0.65. Table 4.23 documents the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores and teacher burnout scores by principal age.

Table 4.23 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by Principal Age as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

	Principal Age					
	35 years and under		36 - 45 years		46 years and older	
	Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust	1	.620**	1	.611**	1	.652**
Burnout	.620**	1	.611**	1	.652**	1
(N)	30	30	165	165	112	112

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

All of the groups reported correlations that were significant at the $p<0.01$ level for the two-tailed test of significance. Therefore, the age of the teacher's principal does not seem to influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship in this study.

Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for the Race of the Teacher's Principal

Does the principal's race influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship? Due to the small number of teachers with an African American, Hispanic, Asian, or other race principal, the researcher combined the principal races into two categories: One category for Caucasian principals and one category for African American, Hispanic, Asian, or other race principals. The multivariate cross-tabulation

for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal suggested that the race of the teacher's principal does not influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship found earlier in this study. For example, while controlling for the race of the teacher's principal, teachers with African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race principals who reported low trust in the principal were only about 7 percent more likely to score high for teacher burnout. Table 4.24 reports the teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal, controlling for principal race.

Table 4.24 - Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Principal Race as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools (in Percentages)

	Principal Race					
	Caucasian			African Amer., Hispanic, Asian, and Other		
Teacher Burnout	Teacher Trust in the Principal			Teacher Trust in the Principal		
	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
Low	82.7	42.9	21.7	93.3	46.5	0
Moderate	17.3	47.3	52.2	6.7	46.5	66.7
High	0	9.8	26.1	0	7.0	33.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(104)	(112)	(23)	(15)	(43)	(9)

The chi square for this comparison was 56.93 with 4 degrees of freedom for teachers with Caucasian principals

and 23.76 with 4 degrees of freedom for teachers with African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race principals, which are both statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level. Also, the contingency coefficients were 0.439 for teachers with Caucasian principals and 0.512 for teachers with African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race principals, thus suggesting a strong relationship for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal controlling for principal gender.

The Pearson product-moment correlations confirm the results of the multivariate cross-tabulation for this comparison. First, the researcher wanted to rule out that the principal's race was not directly related to teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout. The correlation between teacher burnout and principal race was -0.04, and the correlation between teacher trust in the principal and principal race was -0.19. Table 4.25 shows the Pearson product-moment correlation among teacher trust in the principal scores, teacher burnout scores, and principal race as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools.

Table 4.25 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores, Teacher Burnout Scores, and Principal Race as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

		Trust Score	Burnout Score	Principal Race
Trust Score		1		
Burnout Score		.609**	1	
Principal Race		-.186**	-.044	1
	N	315	315	315

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As with the other demographic variables, the researcher found no correlation between teacher burnout and principal race or teacher trust in the principal and principal race.

When the researcher conducted a correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by principal race, no significant differences were observed. The researcher found that teachers with a Caucasian principal scored a correlation of 0.59 and teachers with an African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race principal scored a 0.67. The correlation for both categories was significant at the $p<0.01$ level for the two-tailed test of significance. Table 4.26 shows the results of the Pearson product-moment correlation among the teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout scores by principal race.

Table 4.26 - Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Among Teacher Trust in the Principal Scores and Teacher Burnout Scores by Principal Race as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

	Principal Race			
	Caucasian		African Amer., Hispanic, Asian, and Other	
	Trust Score	Burnout Score	Trust Score	Burnout Score
Trust	1	.592**	1	.677**
Burnout	.592**	1	.677**	1
(N)	(239)	(239)	(67)	(67)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression of Teacher Burnout on Teacher Trust in the Principal and Demographic Variables

A multivariate regression analysis displayed in Table 4.27 for teacher burnout indicated that teacher trust in the principal and the demographic variables in this study accounted for approximately 40% of the variance for teacher burnout ($R^2 = 0.396$; $F(9,305) = 22.26$) and is significant at the $p<0.001$ level. According to this analysis, teacher trust in the principal had the most effect on teacher burnout (beta = 0.621). All the other variables had virtually no effect on teacher burnout.

Table 4.27 - Regression of Teacher Burnout on Trust in the Principal and Demographic Variables

Variables	B	Beta	t	Sig.[a]
(Constant)	-1.285		-5.944	.000
Trust Score	.343	.621	13.506	.000
Teacher Gender	.148	.086	1.823	.069
Teacher Age	.009	.014	.233	.816
Teacher Race	.007	.007	.142	.887
Teaching Experience	.005	.010	.160	.873
Years Worked with Principal	-.004	-.005	-.103	.918
Principal Gender	.156	.109	2.365	.019
Principal Age	-.060	-.080	-1.591	.113
Principal Race	.083	.103	1.965	.050

a. The Trust Score was significant at the p<.001 level. Principal Gender and Principal Race were significant at the p<.05 level. All other variables were not significant.

Finally, as observed in Table 4.28, a regression removing the independent variable of teacher trust in the principal shows the demographic variables accounting for only about 4 percent of the variance in teacher burnout ($R^2 = 0.036$; $F(8,306) = 1.408$), but is not statistically significant with a value of $p<0.192$. Therefore, although other demographic variables have some slight effects on teacher burnout, teacher trust in the principal accounts for a majority of the variance found in this study.

Table 4.28 - Regression of Teacher Burnout on Demographic Variables

	B	Beta	t	Sig.[a]
(Constant)	.268		1.159	.247
Teacher Gender	.052	.030	.507	.612
Teacher Age	.050	.079	1.035	.302
Teacher Race	.045	.043	.744	.458
Teaching Experience	.016	.029	.381	.703
Years Worked with Principal	-.025	-.030	-.484	.629
Principal Gender	.191	.133	2.288	.023
Principal Age	-.052	-.069	-1.098	.273
Principal Race	-.017	-.022	-.331	.741

a. Principal Gender was significant at the p<.05 level. All other variables were not significant.

Summary for Teacher Burnout by Teacher Trust in the Principal, Controlling for Demographic Variables

The results of this study indicated a moderate to strong association between teacher burnout and teacher trust in the principal. In addition, the Pearson product-moment correlation of 0.61 ($p<0.01$) showed a strong, positive relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout. In the previous sections, the researcher answered the question as to whether or not demographic variables influenced the trust-burnout relationship.

Do demographic variables mediate the trust-burnout relationship? First, the researcher compared the Pearson

product-moment correlations between each demographic variable with teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout separately to establish that the demographic variables are not causing the relationship found between trust in the principal and teacher burnout. This analysis indicated that the demographic variables in this study were not directly related to teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout. In other words, the demographic variables were not related individually with teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout. However, just because the Pearson product-moment correlation for the demographic variables do not individually display a relationship with teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout, this observation does not mean that the demographic variables do not affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

According to this study, teacher gender appears to have a slight effect on the teacher trust-burnout relationship. In addition, teacher age appears to moderately influence the trust-burnout relationship. Although the results of the study initially suggested that teacher race influences the teacher trust-burnout relationship, the researcher was cautious in drawing any conclusions based on the results due to the small number of

African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race teacher respondents. The results of this analysis indicated that the teacher's years experience moderately affects the teacher trust-burnout relationship for teachers reporting low trust in the principal. Both cross-tabulations and the Pearson product-moment correlations suggested that the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal strongly influences the trust-burnout relationship.

After completing the analysis for the demographic variables relating to the teacher, the researcher investigated the demographic factors relating to the principal; principal gender, principal age, and principal race. Principal gender does not affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship. In addition, Pearson product-moment correlations revealed that the principal's age did not significantly change the correlation between trust in the principal and teacher burnout, and therefore, did not influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship. The multivariate cross-tabulation for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal suggested that the race of the teacher's principal does not influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship found earlier in this study.

Finally, the multivariate regression analysis suggested that teacher trust in the principal and the demographic variables in this study account for nearly 40 percent of the variance for teacher burnout.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter IV presented the results of the data analysis including cross tabulations, chi square tests, contingency coefficients, and Pearson product-moment correlations between teacher trust in the principal, teacher burnout, and demographic variables. Chapter V will report a summary, conclusions, discussions, recommendations, and recommendations for further research.

Summary

One purpose of this study was to analyze teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools. The researcher attempted to answer the following questions during this study:

1. Is there a relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools?
2. Do other variables, such as demographic factors, mediate the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools?

Conclusions

Is there a relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools? While analyzing the data for the first research question, a cross-tabulation revealed that teachers who indicated low trust in the principal are about 28 percent more likely to experience high teacher burnout. In fact, out of the 315 teachers who completed this survey, not one teacher who reported high teacher trust in the principal scored high on teacher burnout. Additionally, a Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a strong, positive correlation of 0.61 between teacher trust in the principal scores and teacher burnout scores, which was significant at the $p<0.01$ level for a two-tailed test for significance. The cross tabulation and the Pearson product-moment correlation both showed a strong association and a strong, positive correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout.

Do other variables, such as demographic factors, mediate the relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools? To address this question, the researcher first used the Pearson product-moment

correlation to explore the relationship between teacher trust in the principal compared to demographic variables and teacher burnout compared to demographic variables, such as teacher gender, teacher age, teacher race, number of years teaching experience, number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal, principal age, principal gender, and principal race. The Pearson product-moment correlations between these demographic variables indicated no direct relationship between the variables. Therefore, the demographic variables in this study were not directly related to the teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout. In other words, the demographic variables were not related individually with teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout. However, just because the Pearson product-moment correlation for the demographic variables does not individually display a relationship with teacher trust in the principal or teacher burnout does not mean that the demographic variables do not affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship. In fact, the multivariate cross-tabulation analysis produced results supporting the effects for some of the variables on the relationship.

The multivariate demographic analysis indicated that females who reported low trust in the principal are about 8

percent more likely to fall into the high teacher burnout category than males are. Therefore, teacher gender only slightly influences the strength of the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

Teachers 35 years of age and younger reporting low trust in the principal were 23 percent more likely to score high on teacher burnout compared to teachers 46 years and older. The Pearson product-moment analysis also confirmed the differences in the teacher trust-burnout relationship. Teachers 35 years and younger displayed a correlation of 0.66 while teachers 46 years and older displayed a correlation of 0.59. In other words, teacher age appears to have a moderate influence on the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

Although the results of this study initially appeared to signify a stronger relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout with Asians, African Americans, and Hispanics, the researcher was cautious in drawing any conclusions based on the results due to the small number of respondents in those three categories.

The results of this analysis indicated that the teacher’s years experience moderately influences the teacher trust-burnout relationship for teachers reporting

low trust in the principal. For example, teachers with 1 to 14 years experience reporting low trust in the principal were approximately 26 percent more likely to report high teacher burnout than teachers with 15 or more years experience.

In this analysis, teachers who reported low trust in the principal were approximately 29 percent more likely to score high on teacher burnout if they had worked with the principal for 5 years or more than those teachers who had worked with their principal for 4 or less years. Both the cross-tabulation and the Pearson product-moment correlations suggested that the number of years that the teacher has worked with the principal strongly influences the trust-burnout relationship. More specifically, if a teacher does not trust the principal, the likelihood that the teacher will become burned out will increase the longer that the teacher continues to work with the principal.

After completing the analysis for the demographic variables relating to the teacher, the researcher investigated the demographic factors relating to the principal; principal gender, principal age, and principal race. In this analysis, teachers with male principals who reported low trust in their principal were only about 4

percent more likely to score high on teacher burnout than those teachers with female principals. The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation confirm the findings from the cross-tabulation. Therefore, the gender of the teacher's principal does not appear to affect the teacher trust-burnout relationship.

Supporting the assumption that the small number of respondents with principals under 35 years of age may have affected the results of the cross-tabulation, the Pearson product-moment correlations revealed that the principal's age did not significantly change the correlation between trust in the principal and teacher burnout. Therefore, the age of the teacher's principal does not appear to influence the trust-burnout relationship.

The multivariate cross-tabulation for teacher burnout by teacher trust in the principal suggested that the race of the teacher's principal does not influence the teacher trust-burnout relationship found earlier in this study. For example, while controlling for the race of the teacher's principal, teachers with African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other race principals who reported low trust in the principal were only about 7 percent more likely to score high for teacher burnout. When the researcher conducted a

correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout by principal race, no significant differences were observed.

Finally, a regression analysis for teacher burnout indicated that teacher trust in the principal and the demographic variables in this study, account for approximately 40 percent of the variance for teacher burnout ($R^2 = 0.396$; $F(9,305) = 22.26$) and is significant at the $p<0.001$ level. According to this analysis, teacher trust in the principal had the most effect on teacher burnout (beta = 0.621). The other variables have virtually no effect on teacher burnout.

Discussion

Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) contend that "a contemporary view of relationships and the dynamics within them suggests that we need to stop viewing relationships as unidimensional and uniplex and, instead, see them as complex, multidimensional constructs" (p. 444). In addition, Bryk and Schneider (2003) argue that the "principals' actions play a key role in developing and sustaining relational trust" (p. 43).

The results of this study confirm the extensive review of the literature. Although this is the first study found

on the specific relationship between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout, many of the findings in this study confirm previous research relating to both constructs. For example, Hoy, Sabo, and Barnes (1996) studied the organizational health of 86 middle schools and showed results indicating that trust and health complement each other. To have a healthy organization there must be trust. Furthermore, Noworol, et al., (1993) argue that “the potential effects of burnout are serious, both for the individual staff members and for entire organization. The syndrome plays an important role in absenteeism, turnover, and low morale” (p. 164). Superintendents and principals alike need to focus on developing trusting relationships to improve the school climate, increase student performance, and reduce teacher burnout.

Recommendations

With the increasing demands of state mandated testing, No Child Left Behind, and improving standards for all students, principals and superintendents need to understand the relationship between the factors that influence student performance and a positive learning environment. These higher standards and expectations will amplify the necessity for teachers to perform in the classroom, thus

increasing teacher stress and teacher burnout. Based on the findings and conclusion in this study, the researcher makes the following recommendations.

First, principals must be willing to create and maintain positive working relationships with their teachers. Principals should begin by being kind toward their teachers. In addition, principals must be open, honest, benevolent, truthful, and competent in their roles. In order to create a positive learning environment for all constituents, principals must always remember that trust is the foundation for any relationship, and that without trust, the relationship will struggle, if not fail. The results of this study sturdily implicate the strong correlation between teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout. If principals do not actively develop trusting relationships with their teachers, they risk creating working environments where teachers are burned out and less productive.

Second, superintendents have an obligation to insist that their principals spend time on developing trusting relationships with their teachers. Superintendents should require yearly professional development activities that promote “team building” and foster “relationship building.”

Examples of professional development activities that can assist principals in developing trusting relationships include “ropes” courses, personality identification and development systems, and simply engaging in “fun” activities that are more about getting to know the individual than discussing routine procedures. Superintendents must continually remind principals that relationships with teachers can be the building blocks for a successful school system.

Finally, the researcher would encourage universities and Colleges of Education to integrate the importance of developing relationships in schools into the curriculum for their student teachers and aspiring principals. Again, with the basic element of a successful relationships being trust, teacher and administrator certification programs should include this topic in the curriculum and in classroom activities.

In sum, as the political pressures from local, state and federal entities continue to push for higher standards in the pubic schools, administrators have an obligation to ensure that teachers can overcome the obstacles that may interfere with classroom teaching. This study has shown that teacher trust in the principal and teacher burnout

have a strong, positive correlation of 0.61 ($p<0.01$) and that teacher trust in the principal accounts for nearly 40 percent of the variance with teacher burnout. This finding cannot be disregarded. Principals must develop trusting relationships with their teachers in order to reduce teacher burnout and create a more positive working environment.

Recommendations for Further Research

To help educators better understand the complex dimensions of trusting relationships, additional research must be completed to define more effectively the factors that lead to trusting relationships within the school system. Trust research is thorough in business and the social sciences but is limited in the educational environment. In addition, further research can establish how trusting relationships between the principal and the teacher affects other variables such as school ratings in Texas, student performance, teacher efficacy, and a positive learning environment.

This study should be replicated with a larger teacher population to determine whether the correlation will hold strong for a larger sample size. In addition, the replication of this study with a larger population would

assist in analyzing the demographics of the teachers and the principals with a smaller response rate, such as African American and Hispanic teachers and principals.

REFERENCES

Abel, M.H. & Sewell, J. (1999). Stress and burnout in rural and urban secondary school teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *92*(5), 287 – 293.

Baloche, L. (1998). *The cooperative classroom: Empowering learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beck, L. (1994). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Blumberg, A., Greenfield, W. D., & Nason, D. (1978). The substance of trust between teachers and principals. *National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Bulletin*, *62*, 76-88.

Boss, R. W. (1978). Trust and managerial problem solving revisited. *Group & Organization Studies*, *3*(3), 331 - 342.

Brissie, J.S., Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., & Bassler, O.C. (1988). Individual, situational contributors to teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, *82*(2), 106 – 112.

Bryk, A.S. & Schneider, B. (2003, March). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 40 – 44.

Burisch, M. (1993). In search of theory: Some ruminations on the nature and etiology of burnout. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 75 – 93). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Busman, D. (1991). *The influence of principal authenticity and teacher participation in decision-making on faculty trust* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1990).

Byrne, B.M. (1994). Burnout: Testing for validity, replication, and invariance of casual structure across elementary, intermediate, and secondary teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*(3), 645 – 673.

Cherniss, C. (1992). Long-term consequences of burnout: An exploratory study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *13*, 1 – 11.

Covey, S.R. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Creed, W.E.D. & Miles, R.E. (1996). Trust in organizations: A conceptual framework linking organizational forms, managerial philosophies, and the opportunity cost of controls. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 16 – 38). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cummings, L.L. & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 302 – 330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cunningham, W. G. (1983). Teacher burnout – Solutions for the 1980's: A review of the literature. *The Urban Review*, *15*(1), 37 – 51.

Driscoll, J. W. (1973). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *21*(1), 44 - 56.

Dworkin, G.A. (1987). *Teacher burnout in the public schools: Structural causes and consequences for children*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Dworkin, G.A. (2001). Perspectives on teacher burnout and school reform. *International Education Journal*, *2*(2), 69 – 78.

Dworkin, G.A., Saha, L.J. & Hill, A.N. (2003). Teacher burnout and perceptions of a democratic school environment. *International Education Journal*, *4*(2), 108 – 121.

Farber, B.A. (1984a). Stress and burnout in suburban teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, *77*(6), 325 – 331.

Farber, B.A. (1984b, Winter). Teacher burnout: Assumptions, myths, and issues. *Teacher College Record*, *86*(2), 321 – 338.

Fox, W. (1998). *Social statistics* (3rd ed.). Bellevue, WA: MicroCase Corporation.

Friedman, I.A. (1991). High- and low-burnout schools: School culture aspects of teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research*, *84*(6), 325 – 333.

Friedman, I.A. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *88*(5), 281 – 289.

Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, *30*, 159 – 165.

Freudenberger, H.J. & Richelson, G. (1980). *Burnout: The high cost of high achievement*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Frost, T. & Moussavi, F. (1992). The relationship between leader power base and influence: The moderating role of trust. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, *8*(4), 9-14.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.

Golembiewski, R. & McConkie, M. (1975). The centrality of trust in group processes. In G. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of group processes* (pp. 131 – 185). New York: John Wiley.

Hallsten, L. (1993). Burning out: A framework. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 95 – 113). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Hobfoll, S.E. & Freedy, J. (1993). Conservation of resources: A general stress theory applied to burnout. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 115 – 129). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., Bliss, J. & Hoy, W.K. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, *4*(9), 484 - 501.

Hosmer, L.T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 379-403.

Howell, D.C. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.

Hoy, W.K. & Kupersmith, W.J. (1984). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior, planning and changing. *Journal for School Administrators*, *15*, 80-88.

Hoy, W.K. & Kupersmith, W.J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faculty trust. *Educational and Psychological Research*, *5*, 1-10.

Hoy, W.K., Sabo, D., & Barnes, K. (1996). Organizational health and faculty trust: A view from the middle level. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly, 19*(3), 21-39.

Hoy, W.K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2002). *The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, Ohio State University.

Jackson, S.E. & Maslach, C. (1982). After-effects of job-related stress: families as victims. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, *3*, 63 – 77.

Jackson, S.E., Schwab, R.L. & Schuler, R.S. (1986). Toward an understanding of the burnout phenomenon. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(4), 630 – 640.

Jones, G.R. & George, J.M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 531 – 546.

Kanter, R.M. (1997). *On the frontiers of management*. Boston, MA: A Harvard Business Review Book.

Kupersmith, W.J. & Hoy, W.K. (1989). *The concept of trust: An empirical assessment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kyriacou, C. (1987). Teacher stress and burnout: An international review. *Educational Research*, *29*(2), 146 – 152.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D.P., Cooper, J.E., Lambert, M.D., Gardner, M.E., et al. (1995). *The constructivist leader.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lester, P.E. & Bishop, L.K. (2000). *Handbook on tests and measurement in education and the social sciences* (2nd Ed). London: Scarecrow Press, 313 – 314.

Lewicki, R.J. & Bunker, B.B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114 – 139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J. & Bies, R.J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 438 – 458.

MacNeil, A.J. & Blake, M. (1995a). *Principal leadership, trust and the quality of schools*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Houston Clear Lake.

MacNeil, A.J. & Blake, M. (1995b). *Trust: The quality required for successful management*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Houston Clear Lake.

MacNeil, A.J. & Blake, M. (1998). Trust: The quality required for successful management. In Y. Cano, F.H. Wood, & J.C. Simmons (Eds.), *Creating high functioning schools* (pp. 29 – 39). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

MacNeil, A.J. & Ceyanes, J.W. (1998). *How teachers create trusting relationships with their principal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston, TX.

MacNeil, A.J., Spuck, D.W. & Ceyanes, J.W. (1998). *Developing trust between principal and teachers*. Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, St. Louis, MO.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S.E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *2*, 99 – 113.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S.E. (1984). Burnout in organizational settings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual 5* (pp. 133 – 154). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S.E. (1986). *The Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Maxwell, J.C. (1993). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

McFarland, L., Senn, L. & Childress, J. (1994). *21st century leadership: Dialogues with 100 top leaders*. Los Angeles, CA: The Leadership Press.

McKnight, D.H., Cummings, L.L., & Chervany, N.L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 473 – 490.

Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 261 – 287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mishra, J. & Morrissey, M. (1990). Trust in employee/employer relationships: A survey of West Michigan managers. *Public Personnel Management*, *19*(4), 443-461.

National Education Association. (1979). *Nationwide teacher opinion poll*. Washington, DC: Author.

Norton, M., Webb, L., Dlugosh, L., & Sybouts, W. (1996). *The school superintendency*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Noworol, C., Zarczynski, Z., Fafrowicz, M., & Marek, T. (1993). Impact of professional burnout on creativity and innovation. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 163 – 175). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Ouchi, W. (l981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Pines, A.M. (1993). Burnout: An existential perspective. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 33 – 51). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Rempel, J. & Holmes, J. (1986, February). How do I trust thee? *Psychology Today*, 28-34.

Rousseau, D.M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S. & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 393 – 404.

Schmuck, R. & Schmuck, P. (1997). *Group processes in the classroom*. Dubuque, IA: Times Mirror Education Group.

Schwab, R.L. & Iwanicki, E.F. (1982, Winter). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *18*(1), 60 – 74.

Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. *American Sociological Review*, *24*(7), 83 – 91.

Seeman, M. (1975). Alienation studies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *1*, 91 – 123.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Seyfarth, J.T. (1999). *The principalship: New leadership for new challenges*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shinn, M. (1982). Methodological issues: Evaluating and using information. In W.S. Paine (Ed.), *Job stress and burnout: Research, theory, and intervention perspectives* (pp. 61 – 82). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Speck, M. (1999). *The principalship: Building a learning community*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tarter, C.J., Bliss, J.R., & Hoy, W.K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *25*(3), 294 – 308.

Tarter, C.J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W.K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust, and effectiveness: A path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *29*(1), 41 – 49.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W.K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*, 547 – 593.

Tyler, T.R. & Kramer, R.M. (1996). Wither trust? In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 1 – 15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walsh, W.B. & Betz, N.E. (2001). *Tests and assessment* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard, M.A., & Werner, J.M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 513 – 530.

Whitney, J.0. (1994). *The trust factor: Liberating profits and restoring corporate vitality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Winnubst, J. (1993). Organizational structure, social support, and burnout. In W.B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, and T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 151 – 162). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Zand, D.E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*, 229-239.

APPENDIX A

Information Sheet

Level of Trust in Principal and Teacher Burnout as Identified by Teachers in Selected Texas Public Schools

---

1. You understand that approximately 500 teachers from selected Texas public schools will participate in this survey.

2. You understand that the purpose of this study is to analyze the level of trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools. The researcher will use the results of this survey for writing a dissertation to complete the requirements for a Ph.D. at Texas A&M University.

3. You understand that the survey will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

4. You understand that you will not receive any benefit for completing the survey.

5. You understand that you will not receive any monetary compensation for completing the survey.

6. You understand that no medical records or other personal records will be examined or used.

7. You understand that you may refuse to answer any question that makes you feel uncomfortable. If you refuse to answer a question, you understand that your survey will be removed from the population sample.

8. You understand that participation is voluntary and that you may withdraw from the study at any time and that such withdrawal will not affect any treatment, employment, or other benefits.

9. You understand that your survey may be withdrawn from the sample for purposes determined by the researcher which will not affect you in any way.

10. You understand that your responses will remain confidential. All personal identifiers will be removed from your response as soon as the researcher validates that your answers were accurately downloaded into the database.

11. You understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board - Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subject's rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, and Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067, mwbuckley@tamu.edu.

You have read and understand the explanation provided to you. You have had all your questions answered to your satisfaction, and you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

The researcher will use your personal information for consent purposes and to ensure that a person does not take the survey more than once. This sheet forwards information to a separate database that is not directly connected to the survey. All survey results will remain absolutely confidential and no data will be reported for any individual.

First Name

Last Name

I Agree

Please print a copy of this notice for your records.

For questions relating to this document please contact Jason W. Ceyanes at (936) 597-3015, jceyanes@misd.org, or Dr. Robert Slater at Texas A&M University, (979) 845-5099.

Survey for Measuring Trust and Teacher Burnout in Public Schools

The following survey will be used to measure trust and teacher burnout in selected public schools.

- All responses will remain confidential. In no way will your responses be reported individually to your supervisor.
- Please answer honestly and openly to each question. ALL questions must be answered for your results to be scored.

Submit Reset

For each question, check the value that best reflects your feelings or thought. (Omnibus T-Scale)*

1. Teachers in this school trust the principal.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Teachers in this school trust each other.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Teachers in this school trust their students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*Reprinted with permission from "The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-Scale" by Hoy, W.K. & Tschannen-Moran, M., 2002. Unpublished document, Ohio State University.

4. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Teachers in this school trust the parents.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9. The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of teachers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Students in this school care about each other.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

12. Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Teachers in this school do their jobs well.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

14. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

15. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

16. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

17. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

18. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

19. The teachers in this school are open with each other.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

20. Teachers can count on parental support.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

21. When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

22. Teachers here believe students are competent learners.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

23. The principal doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

24. Teachers think that most of the parents do a good job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

25. Teachers can believe what parents tell them.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

26. Students here are secretive.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(Dworkin Teacher Burnout Scale)*

1. Those who make the ultimate decisions in the school system really pay attention to my ideas and suggestions.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Sometimes I think a teacher could drop dead or quit and nobody would know or care.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. I cannot imagine my choosing any other career than teaching.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*Reprinted with permission from the *Handbook on tests and measurement in education and the social sciences* 2nd Ed, by Lester, P.E. & Bishop, L.K., 2000. Scarecrow Press, London.

4. Many of the school rules are so rigid and/or absurd that a good teacher must defy regulations.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. My experiences in school have proven that public school teaching is a rewarding career.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. The longer I am in school, the more I realize how little control I have over things that happen here.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. The people I work with and my students make me feel like I'm of vital importance to the school.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. Teachers can get what they want without breaking the rules.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9. I see my job as contributing very little to the betterment of the world.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. I am seriously planning to leave the field of education.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(Added Demographic Questions)

11. I am seriously planning to look for another job at another school or school district.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

1. What is your gender? Click arrow to view choices
2. What is your age? Click arrow to view choices
3. What is your race? Click arrow to view choices
4. What are your years of experience as a teacher? Click arrow to view choices
5. How many years have you worked with your current principal? Click arrow to view choices
6. What is your principal's gender? Click arrow to view choices
7. What is your principal's age? Click arrow to view choices
8. What is your principal's race? Click arrow to view choices

Thank you for your participation.

Submit Reset

For questions relating to this document please contact Jason W. Ceyanes at (936) 597-3015, jceyanes@misd.org, or Dr. Robert Slater at Texas A&M University, (979) 845-5099.

APPENDIX B

-----Original Message-----
From: Jason W. Ceyanes, Sr. [mailto:jceyanes@misd.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2004 8:51 AM
To: Jason Ceyanes
Cc: 'Victor Uher'; 'Dexter Upshaw'; 'Greg Joseph'; 'Greg Poole'; 'Karen Geffert'; 'Larry Johnson'; 'Lee Allen'; 'Pat Buttermore'; 'Paula Almond'; 'Raul Font'; 'Ron Westerfeld'; 'Sikini Morgan'; 'Steve Busch'
Subject: Texas A&M Research
Importance: High

My name is Jason W. Ceyanes, Sr., and I am the Director of Special Projects in Montgomery ISD. I am the former principal at Burton High School and Kingwood Middle School, and I am currently a Doctoral Candidate at Texas A&M University.

I need at least 500 teachers to respond to the survey found at the link below so that I can complete a dissertation titled, "An analysis between the level of trust in the principal and teacher burnout as identified by teachers in selected Texas public schools." This distribution includes nineteen campuses and over 1,300 teachers from three schools districts. The online survey requires only five to ten minutes to complete and is a point and click instrument that does not require any typed responses. I have a federal mandate requiring that all of your responses remain completely confidential. In no way will I report your individual responses to your supervisor or report the results from an individual campus. I will combine and analyze the responses as a total population of teachers with a breakdown of demographic variables.

I appreciate your willingness to complete this survey. Simply click on the link below or copy and paste the link in your browser if it is not highlighted.

Thank you and have a wonderful day.

http://bobhall.tamu.edu/Ceyanes/InformationSheet.html

Jason W. Ceyanes, Sr.
Director of Special Projects – Montgomery ISD
Doctoral Candidate – Texas A&M University

-----Original Message-----
From: Jason W. Ceyanes, Sr. [mailto:jceyanes@misd.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2004 8:36 AM
To:
Subject: Final Texas A&M Research - Follow-up
Importance: High

I would like to thank each of you who have already completed the survey for this research. I understand that this is a very busy time of the school year, and I appreciate you taking five minutes of your time to help. At this time, I still need many more teachers to complete this survey. The web site for data collection will be active until **Wednesday, May 26, 2004**. If you have not had the opportunity to provide your feedback on the survey, please try to do so by May 26th.

The survey is located at the following link:

http://bobhall.tamu.edu/Ceyanes/InformationSheet.html

Thank you again for your assistance, and have a wonderful summer break!

Jason W. Ceyanes, Sr.
Director of Special Projects – Montgomery ISD
Doctoral Candidate – Texas A&M University

VITA

JASON W. CEYANES, SR.

17337 Sunset Ranch Drive Home (936)588-3476
Montgomery, TX 77316

Marital Status: Married to Kimberly Kay Ceyanes
Children: James R. "J.R." - 3 months of age
Judson H. – 1 year of age
Chloe K. – 4 years of age
Jason W., II – 6 years of age
Joshuah W. – 10 years of age
Sharayah E. – 14 years of age

Experience

2002 – Present Director of Special Projects: Montgomery ISD

2001 - 2002 Principal: Kingwood Middle School in Humble ISD

2000 – 2001 Principal: Burton High School

1998 – 2000 Assistant Principal: Magnolia Junior High

1997 – 1998 Physical Science Teacher: Klein Forest High School in Humble ISD

1995 – 1997 Biology Teacher: Dickinson High School

1994 – 1995 In School Suspension Aide: K.E. Little Elementary in Dickinson ISD

Education

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Texas A&M University, 2004. Educational Administration

Master of Science (M.S.) University of Houston - Clear Lake, 1998. Educational Mid-Management

Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) University of Houston - Clear Lake, 1995. Biological Sciences